

Sherwood (W) [1856]

HISTORY OF THE EXPULSION

OF
DRS. R. S. NEWTON AND Z. FREEMAN

FROM THE

ECLECTIC MEDICAL INSTITUTE.

With the causes which rendered it necessary, and an exposition of the slanderous and factious course which has been pursued by the off-casts from the Institute.

BY W. SHERWOOD, M. D.

For several years past, a feeling of dissatisfaction with the professional conduct and capacities of Dr. R. S. Newton has been steadily increasing among the Faculty, students and graduates of the Eclectic Medical Institute. Every member of the Faculty had more than once expressed, privately, to his colleagues his dissatisfaction with Dr. Newton, as a professor, disapprobation of his course, and a conviction of the necessity of opposing his machinations. Three members of the Faculty, (Drs. Bickley, King and Sherwood) had threatened a resignation of their posts, on account of their dissatisfaction with his character as a colleague; and one (Dr. Bickley) had actually written his resignation on that account, but subsequently withheld it. In addition to this dissatisfaction, which at times threatened the disorganization of the Faculty, Dr. Newton himself, from personal enmity, pursued a course of public and private warfare against Dr. Cleveland, and endeavored (notwithstanding he could find no fault with him as a faithful and able teacher) to procure his rejection from his chair, by the Board of Trustees. It was evident, therefore, that Dr. Newton's continuance in the Faculty, even if he had been competent to discharge his duties in a superior manner, was incompatible with the permanence and prosperity of the College, and that a dissolution would be inevitable. This discord was brought to a crisis by the attempt of Dr. N. to overthrow the entire Faculty.

He was hostile to Dr. King, because Dr. K. refused to allow his [Newton's] name to appear any longer in the American Eclectic Dispensary as joint author of a work to which he had not contributed a line, nor had then seen a single page, and because Dr. King charged him with endeavoring to defraud him of the copy-right, and declined any longer to bolster up Dr. Newton's literary pretensions, by writing matter to appear under his (Dr. N's) name.

He was hostile to Dr. Cleveland, because that gentleman refused to recognize adulterated medicines, proved such by chemical analysis, as worthy of being recommended to the medical class; and because he denounced the fraud as it deserved.

He was hostile to Drs. Buchanan, Hoyt and myself, because we would not co-operate with him in making war upon Drs. King and Cleveland, and because, like our associates, we disapproved of much of his conduct, and considered the management of the clinic unsatisfactory, and not in accordance with his promises. He was bitterly hostile to Drs. Cleveland and King, because they sometimes privately expressed their true opinions, or rather knowledge of his scientific deficiencies as a Pro-

fessor. Dr. Freeman alone was tolerated by him, as he had been induced by self-interest to co-operate with Dr. N.

Under these circumstances a conspiracy was formed by Dr. Newton, with his inveterate enemy, L. E. Jones, during the Winter and Spring of 1855-56, to gratify their common malice against the Faculty, and remove the old Board of Trustees.

It was true that Dr. L. E. Jones despised Dr. Newton more heartily than any other member of the Faculty, and that Dr. N. reciprocated his feelings with interest; but he knew that Dr. L. E. J. was willing to co-operate with him for revenge, while he supposed the Faculty would submit no longer to his presence. Hence, the combination was formed to unite their votes in the April election, remove the old Board of Trustees and Faculty, and place in their stead Drs. Newton, Jones, Baldridge, &c., as Trustees and Professors.

The conspiracy was carried out—but the conspirators had not enough of stock to carry the election. New stockholders took stock at par, for the benefit of the Institute, and voted for the old Board, thus, defeating the conspirators, whose purchase of stock below par, at a heavy discount, for the purpose of controlling the election, did not avail them. Nevertheless, they pretended to have carried the election, proceeded to organize themselves as a Board of Trustees, and instituted legal proceedings to obtain possession, and to enjoin the Faculty and Trustees from further action. They were twice defeated in the Superior Court, after disturbing greatly the progress of the session, by their factious litigation, and then resorted to mob violence, broke into the College building at night, and held possession, by a force of armed men. In which position they continue the contest, until the result can be legally decided and their possession terminated by law. When this course was adopted, the Board of Trustees did what should have been done some years since—expelled Dr. Newton and his accessory Dr. Freeman, after giving them repeated opportunities to defend themselves from the charges preferred by the Faculty.

The members of the Faculty declined to engage in a riotous contest with the mobocrats, for the sake of a few week's occupation of their Hall, and continued their lectures, in another hall, to the close of the session; attended by all of the class, except a few individuals, who had been seduced or deceived by Drs. Newton and Freeman, and who attended their lectures at the clinical lecture room.

Since the end of the session an incessant publication and circulation of the most extravagant falsehoods, and the most malicious slanders throughout our country, has been kept up by Dr. Newton

and his associates, who are so thoroughly desperate that they have lost sight of all ordinary prudence, and take no pains to keep their falsehoods within the limits of credibility, but fabricate the most notorious untruths, statements known to be false by the students of the Institute, as if, despairing of receiving any support from the intelligent and honest, they hoped merely to impose upon young men from a distance, who know nothing of the history of the Institute, or character of its Faculty.

It has been a matter of great doubt whether such falsehoods deserve any notice at all. With those who know that "*Newton's Express*" has no reputation at present, among the respectable newspapers of Cincinnati, that its editor has been publicly denounced for his "*venality*" and dishonesty; its statements have no influence. When Dr. Newton was a member of the Faculty, a resolution of censure against his newspaper was prevented from being adopted, only by his assurance that nothing should appear in its columns calculated to convey, in any manner, the idea that his *Express* had any connection with the Eclectic Medical Institute.

If there are any who have allowed the falsehoods of that scurrilous sheet to have an influence upon their minds, I would call their attention to the evidences which are to be offered, that the sources of its calumnies, Drs. Newton and L. E. Jones, are both notorious calumniators, and both destitute of veracity; that although they now co-operate in revenge, each knows and has proclaimed the other to be a liar, utterly unprincipled, as regards the circulation of slander, and what is more emphatic still, this accusation of each has been fully sustained by proof. I propose, as briefly as possible, to show that nothing which they say is entitled to any credit, when they have any strong motive to violate the truth. I propose also, to show the degradation and quackery in which the Eclectic Medical Institute was involved by the presence of Dr. R. S. Newton, and the consequent necessity for his removal, and finally, to exhibit, by their own admissions and publications, the true character of the spurious faculty, now combined with him to destroy the old organization of the Institute.

CAUSES OF DR. NEWTON'S EXPULSION.

1. **ILLITERACY.**—That a professor should have been so long tolerated (for five years), who was so imperfectly acquainted with the principles and practice of grammar, rhetoric, or even orthography, was certainly a remarkable fact. Dr. Newton was not chosen on account of his scientific attainments, but it was not known how defective he was. He was supposed to be a good surgeon, as he had pushed himself into notoriety, and supposed, also, to be a very successful practitioner, and to be capable of learning to spell correctly, and cultivating his mind up to the standard of what would be respectable mediocrity, but all these suppositions fell short of being realized, and the Faculty had the mortification of hearing some of their most intelligent students express themselves as being ashamed to have students from other Colleges visit their Hall while Dr. Newton was lecturing. Confused in his ideas and in his modes of expression, the student often failed to find any interest or profit in his lecture. One of the most intelligent graduates of the Institute remarked, that, during his first course of lectures he derived benefit from all the other professors, but supposed that his inability to be instructed by Dr. Newton was owing to his own ignorance; during the second session, however, (having more confidence in himself) he came to the conclusion that the difficulty was owing to the ignorance of the Professor himself. The difficulty was partly overcome by reading his lectures from books. When lecturing on Surgery he read from Hill, and when lecturing on Practice he read from Dr. Powell's manuscript, until the book was published, and then from the book itself. Very few books are fit to be read as lectures, even if read by a good reader, and Dr. Newton's bad reading, with his clumsy comments,

made his department the feeblest in the Institute. Yet, his colleagues were not disposed to be critical, or inquire into his lectures, so long as he kept the class pacified by his affability; and several sessions elapsed before all fully understood what kind of instruction was given by him in the department of Practice, how imperfectly their graduates were taught, as regards that department, and how unscientific the character of the course.

The illiterate character of Dr. Newton was carefully concealed from the public by every possible stratagem. He requested Dr. Buchanan (confessing his own ignorance and inexperience) to take the entire management of the Eclectic Journal, that his editorials might be made suitable for the public eye. He procured from Dr. King, Dr. Powell and others, essays, which he adopted and published as his own, or as the productions of his "*learned brother*," and, thus, always appearing before the public in this borrowed plumage, and before the class with borrowed lectures, he was supposed by many to be really a literary and well educated physician. This was carried to such a disgusting extent, and for such obviously deceptive purposes, that Dr. Buchanan and Dr. King declined to aid him any longer in what at length appeared to be designed for systematic deception of the public. Dr. Cleaveland was then applied to and liberal pecuniary promises made to secure his literary assistance, but Dr. C. refused to allow his own editorials to pass under the name of Dr. Newton.

A desperate effort was also made by Dr. Newton to procure for his name a position on the title-page of King's Dispensatory, but Dr. King refused to permit him to have any connection with the book.

The following memorandum, which has been furnished by Prof. King, from his private diary, exhibits the method by which the Newtons have made an exhibition of professional intelligence before the public. I take the liberty of publishing it, because it exhibits what the public ought to know.

ARTICLES WRITTEN FOR DR. NEWTON, BY DR. J. KING FOR A LIBERAL PECUNIARY COMPENSATION, WHICH WAS PROMISED, BUT NOT REALIZED.

"June 11, 1849, Communication for Cincinnati Gazette, signed "R. S. Newton, M. D."

Let Dr. Newton have an essay on Cancer, intended for Dr. King's own use, and which Dr. N. has continued to publish as his own.

Wrote communication, headed "Treatment of Mortification," by R. S. Newton, M. D., and published in Eclectic Medical Journal, May, 1849.

Wrote communication in reference to Dr. J. C. Kennedy, published in the "Cincinnati Bi-monthly," Sept. 15, 1851.

Wrote communication, headed "Prof. L. M. Lawson vs. Eclecticism," by R. S. Newton, M. D., published in the Eclectic Medical Journal, March, 1851.

Revised, and corrected the grammatical errors, and read proof of "Our Salvation," in Ec. Med. Journal, April, 1851.

Wrote Editorial, signed N., concerning "Hairpin," also, "Notice to Eclectic Practitioners," in Ec. Med. Journal, April, 1851.

Wrote "Cases in Practice," in Ec. Med. Jour., May, 1851.

Wrote editorial, signed N., "Errors in Diagnosis," in Ec. Med. Journal, May, 1851.

Wrote editorial, concerning the "Chemical Department of the Institute," and Dr. Sanders, in Ec. Med. Journal, May, 1851.

Wrote editorial, headed "Medical Progress," in Ec. Med. Journal, May, 1851.

Wrote Editorial, signed N., relative to an article on blue cohosh, in Ec. Med. Journal, August, 1851.

Wrote editorial in reply to "Medicus," in Ec. Medical Journal, 1851.

Wrote editorial on page 527, Ec. Med. Journal, Nov. 1851.

Wrote editorial on page 583, Ec. Med. Journal, Dec. 1851.

Wrote editorial on the "Beauties of Drugging," in Ec. Med. Journal, Sept. 1852.

Revised and corrected the grammar of communication relative to Dr. J. Fowlkes, and Farmers' and Merchants' Bank of Memphis, for Cincinnati Bi-monthly, March, 15, 1852.

Wrote editorial, signed N. on "Treatment of Cholera," and, also, read the proof of the article, published in Ec. Med. Journal, July, 1852.

Revised and corrected the grammar of Editorial headed "Error in Diagnosis of two of our old school physicians, &c.," in Ec. Med. Journal, July, 1852.

Wrote editorial headed "Chloroform," in Cincinnati Bi-monthly, Sept. 5, 1852.

Wrote editorial, signed N., headed "Bad Surgery," in Ec. Med. Journal, October, 1852.

Wrote editorial in relation to "Dr. Jessup," in Ec. Med. Journal, April, 1853.

Edited for Dr. Newton, and read proof of Cincinnati Bi-monthly from August, 1851 to June, 1852.

Wrote small editorials, corrected grammar and orthography of Dr. N.'s remarks, read proof, prepared copy, &c., of Ec. Med. Journal, from April, 1851 to January, 1853.

Read proof of "Chapman on Ulcers," by R. S. Newton, M. D., and corrected, as well as could be done, the grammatical errors of the editor's notes.

Placed Dr. R. S. Newton's name on the "American Eclectic Dispensary," as co-author, a work in which he never wrote a word, and concerning which Dr. Newton never fulfilled his original agreement with Dr. King, for the title of co-author, &c.

Wrote Dr. Newton's part (the Practice) of "Newton and Powell's Practice of Medicine."

"Written for O. E. Newton."—July, 1851, page 196, Nervous Headache. August, 1851, Bad Midwifery. July, 1852, p. 300, Woman, and the laws regulating her health. October, 1852, p. 572, Stricture Dilator. January, 1853, p. 43, Fistula in Ano. February, 1853, p. 68, Report of Cases."

As a portion of Dr. Newton's general course of pretension, boasting and failure, in professional matters, it may be mentioned that in 1851 he procured the appointment of his brother, O. E. Newton, as Demonstrator of Anatomy—an arrangement submitted to with some reluctance upon assurances that he would go to Philadelphia and prepare himself for the post. When the session arrived, he was found to be utterly unqualified—the class were disgusted with his incompetence—he was disgusted himself with his own failure, and amid the general disgust he resigned, to the general satisfaction of all. Always ready, however, to cover up their ignorance by extra pretensions, they procured the publication of a newspaper notice, speaking of Dr. R. S. Newton and his learned brother, Dr. O. E. Newton.

2. ENCUMBRANCE.—Drs. Newton and Freeman, in the general opinion of the Faculty, were decided encumbrances; for although the one might have been useful as a demonstrator of Anatomy, and the other as a business agent, neither was adequate to the satisfactory performance of the duties he had assumed.

The relation of the College to its Professors presents frequently two opposite conditions—they may be either its *supporters* or its *parasites*. If they are men of adequate abilities to sustain and enhance the reputation of the College they are its *supporters*, and with such talents they are generally able to achieve more, both of profit and reputation in other pursuits. Hence, to the true *supporters* of the Institute a professorship is not a position of value. They do not need the College, but the College needs them. They do not intrigue for places, but places are offered them, and they are begged to remain in them as long as possible; and unless they are thus wanted they *can not be retained*; indeed it frequently happens that they can not be procured at all. The opposite class, unfortunately, is much more numerous. Men who have not been able to achieve a satisfactory reputation for themselves wish to borrow from the reputation which others have established for a College. Charlatans wish to obtain respectability from a professorship—young men without talent or any species of superiority, delight to obtain, by appointment, positions which bring them into association with men of high reputation. When such individuals, from the scarcity of suitable candidates, receive appointments, they cling with desperate tenacity to their positions. If they prove to be an encumbrance or a discredit, no hint is broad enough to remove them. It is a difficult matter for a Faculty to get rid of such members, and when removed, they generally become revengeful against those by whom they were displaced. Thus, Colleges have two great obstacles to success; it is difficult to get rid of a true *parasite*, and it is difficult to obtain and retain a true *supporter* long enough to give stability to the Institution. They are often drawn off by their own urgent business or repelled with disgust by the presence of parasites, with whom they are not willing to be associated, and with whom they are reluctant to be drawn into a controversy. As a general rule, all who cling to their places and make war against the unanimous decision of their colleagues, belong to the class of *parasites*.

To illustrate by personal references—Prof. I. G. JONES, an able *supporter*, could not be obtained by the most urgent persuasions of Professors Morrow and Buchanan, until the death of the former produced a crisis, which called for some sacrifice from the supporters of Eclecticism. The Faculty have, urgently and unanimously, desired to retain Prof. Jones, but his health has prevented him from serving since 1851.

Hon. J. B. STALLO was induced to serve as Professor of

Chemistry, but as a man of learning and genius, his legal pursuits were too important to permit him to continue long his term of service, and he resigned to the regret of his associates.

I might here mention also, Prof. R. who was sought for the chair of Chemistry, after the death of Prof. Morrow, but who could not afford to leave his own eminent and lucrative position. Prof. S. and Prof. R. being both unattainable, J. M. Sanders was appointed, and occupied (but not satisfactorily) this position.

Prof. J. R. BUCHANAN was obtained, and has been for ten years retained, by the earnest and unanimous wishes of his associates, although he has given notice for five years past that he was ready to resign his position whenever a satisfactory arrangement for sustaining the professorships could be made. During the Spring of 1856, he gave notice that he would resign at the close of the session, and but for the factious conspiracy against the Faculty, he would have resigned at that time. The condition of the Institute, in his opinion, calls for exertion and sacrifices by its friends, and he is willing to respond to the call.

The Profession will not forget their debt of gratitude to Prof. Buchanan, who has done more to sustain the Institute and elevate its reputation than any other living individual.

Professors J. King, C. H. Cleaveland and J. W. Hoyt, were each selected for their positions by the unanimous wishes of the remainder of the Faculty; and each would have willingly surrendered his position if his services had not still been desired by the majority of the Faculty. Nothing but the urgent persuasions of his colleagues prevented Dr. King from resigning in disgust at the course pursued by Drs. Newton and Freeman. The members of the Faculty know that my own resignation has been repeatedly proffered, if they were willing to accept it. Professors Hoyt and Cleaveland occupy a similar independent position; willing to serve in the cause of science, if they are needed, and have suitable colleagues, but on no other terms. Such have been the supporters of the Institute heretofore, and such, it is believed, will be Professors Burnham and Howe. The profession at large will perceive the absolute necessity of their supporting such men, if they do not wish the College to be sacrificed.

Of *parasites*, the most flagrant examples are found in Drs. Beach, Baldrige, L. E. Jones, R. S. Newton, Z. Freeman, and the would be *parasite*, O. E. Newton. Each has been adjudged a heavy incumbrance, has been unanimously condemned and turned adrift against his own determination to hold on as long as permitted, with the exception of O. E. Newton, who had not sufficient strength to take hold of a position in the dissecting room before he found it necessary to make a precipitate retreat.

Drs. Newton and Freeman belong to the class who need a medical College to uphold their respectability, but a *respectable* College does not need them, and can not afford to carry them. Each intrigued to obtain his position, held on as long as possible, and gave distinct intimations that if they were not retained in the E. M. I. they would attach themselves to some other school. If they had not been parasites, they would have withdrawn peaceably when they found it was necessary to the prosperity of the College.

3. DISREPUTABLE CONDUCT.—In the publication of "Newton's Express," so little regard was paid to the principles of honesty and manliness, and there was such a propensity displayed for making *clandestine* and *slandrous attacks* upon worthy individuals, that it was considered dishonorable to the school to have the editor and publisher of such a sheet connected with the Faculty. In 1854, the Faculty came near disorganizing and separating themselves from Dr. Newton, on account of the discredit which he had brought upon them—one of them actually wrote his resignation (See 9th page of the Announcement of the Spurious Faculty for a full explanation of this matter). Before the Faculty finally determined on his expulsion, Dr. Newton gave unmistakable evidence that he relied upon his Express and Journal to coerce and control the Faculty, and actively engaged in defamatory attacks upon his colleagues, the dishonorable nature of which was heightened by his entering into an agreement to change the course of his Express (at the Faculty meeting, March, 1856), and in the very next issue disregarding and violating his pledge. His habitual disregard of truth and violation of pledges, whenever he had a motive for such a course, constituted one of the principal causes of his rejection and condemnation by the Faculty.

The objectionable style in which Dr. Newton pushed himself into notoriety—his general boasting—his exaggerated pretensions to success in the treatment of cancer, (pretensions which were denied by one of his colleagues

who had a good opportunity of deciding upon their truth) together with his various unfortunate failures in his surgical operations, gave him so low a reputation with the majority of the profession and a great portion of the public, that the effect was felt in its reaction upon the Institute. The name of Dr. Newton was extensively known as that of a *quack*. One of the most intelligent students of the Institute was driven, chiefly by this circumstance, to seek a College of less objectionable reputation at the East. Others have declared that, notwithstanding their esteem for the rest of the Faculty, they could not support the Institute while it retained such men as Newton and Freeman. Physicians of intelligence, who spoke with respect of other members of the Faculty, spoke of Dr. Newton as a discredit to the College. So familiar, indeed, has the public mind become with the recognition of Dr. Newton as a quack, that his name had come to be classed with the names of the most notorious, and a prominent physician, writing in the Cincinnati Medical Observer, a monthly medical review, introduces his name as follows, when speaking of quackery: "All such practitioners, whether they belong to the regular profession or not, must be placed in the same category with such notorious quacks as *Fleish, Newton, Puncost and Root*."

Frequent complaints were made to members of the Faculty, by students and by intelligent graduates, who realized the necessity of a change in the departments of Practice and Surgery. The following is extracted from a letter received by the Dean, in March, 1856, from one of the most intelligent graduates, and is published as a specimen of sentiments which had become very common among the friends of the Institute.

"Please accept my best wishes for your success in the field of Anthropological science; and, also, for still greater success, than it has hitherto enjoyed, of the Eclectic Medical Institute, with which your interests are so closely identified.

"Though I can not *hope*, for the latter, while such inferior men as Newton and Freeman occupy chairs in the school—notwithstanding the high estimation in which I hold the abilities of the other members of the Faculty, I can not recommend young men to attend the Institute while these two occupy professorships in it.

"The Eclectics, I hope, will not longer submit to having inefficient and 'totally depraved' men at the head of their schools. That abominable hybrid work on practice, issued by Newton & Co., has brought the system into disgrace, wherever it has fallen into the hands of intelligent practitioners, or students who were becoming favorable to Eclecticism, and who had no other means of ascertaining the estimation in which it is held by that branch of the profession, than the Eclectic Medical Journal and the circulars of the Institute. The character of the school; and the interest and *character* of Eclectic practitioners, demand a just exposition of the ill-begotten affair. Purge the fountain-head and the stream that pours thence shall be pure.

"P. S. A friend at my elbow, a member of the Eclectic branch of the profession, says he fully and freely indorses all that I have said with regard to the Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute."

4. DISCORDANT, FACTIOUS, AND DISORGANIZING CONDUCT TOWARD PROFESSORS KING AND CLEVELAND.—Having obtained the confidence of Dr. King, and made use of the productions of Dr. K.'s pen, to obtain for himself literary standing, he endeavored to support his reputation still further by Dr. King's abilities, and to compel Dr. K. to publish his name as joint author of King's Dispensatory. Dr. K. however had lost confidence in him; he complained that Dr. N. had taken advantage of him, and had tried to obtain his copy-right unfairly. He refused to insert Dr. Newton's name on his title page, or to surrender the copy-right of his own book. Dr. Newton endeavored to compel Dr. King to submit to his terms by various threats, among which were declarations that he would bring out

another work at a lower price, and supersede the Dispensatory by underselling it. Various efforts were made by Dr. N. to have such a work written by competent persons. Dr. Cleveland was applied to, but did not prove available; an announcement of such a work was printed in a clandestine manner in the Express; and finally, his opposition was bought off by the publishers, who gave him a number of copies of the Dispensatory. A vigorous effort was made by Dr. N. to prevent the Faculty from recommending King's Dispensatory, and various accusations against it were made by him, which were ascertained to be *grossly untrue*. He represented, for example, that it mentioned about a hundred concentrated medicines which had never been manufactured! The grossness of his misrepresentations served only to destroy confidence in his veracity, and excite astonishment at his recklessness.

Dr. King offended Dr. Newton deeply again, by denouncing the impure medicines of Keith & Co., and publishing in medical journals his analysis of them. Dr. Newton refused his communication a place in the Eclectic Medical Journal. The performance of his duty in this matter, by Dr. King, with the co-operation of Professors Cleveland and Hoyt, caused violent attacks upon Drs. King and Cleveland, and upon King's Dispensatory, to be published by Dr. Newton. These attacks, which were written by an *attaché* of the Keith establishment, produced a Faculty meeting on the 6th of March, when Dr. Newton promised reformation, only to break his promise as soon as he could. Dr. King, after the course pursued by Dr. Newton in 1855, did not hesitate to express his opinion of Dr. N.'s professional course and capacities, and to say what he thought of Dr. Newton's claims to extraordinary success in the treatment of cancer, which he discredited.

The course pursued by Dr. Newton toward Dr. King, in reference to his book, was such that Drs. Cleveland, Buchanan, Sherwood and Hoyt, who were made acquainted with the facts, and endeavored to settle the difficulty as disinterested parties, became thoroughly satisfied that Dr. Newton's conduct was *entirely inexcusable and discreditable*.

His course toward Dr. Cleveland was equally censurable and equally reckless of the interests of the school, for, notwithstanding his personal warfare against those gentlemen, he always felt, and has often expressed his high appreciation of them as scientific teachers. He was especially urgent for the appointment of Dr. Cleveland, and expressed the wish that Dr. C. should, after a while, take the chair of Practice. The appointment of Dr. C. had been proposed and thought desirable in 1852; the arrangement was not made, however, until 1854. Upon his arrival, Dr. Newton formed literary engagements with Dr. Cleveland, whose writings he proposed to publish, which engagements were violated; about the same time, also, Dr. Cleveland refused to allow Dr. Newton to appropriate as his own, articles written by Dr. C., and to publish them in the Eclectic Journal over his signature N.

Dr. Newton finding Dr. Cleveland not available as a literary tool, and not willing to assist in his warfare against Dr. King, became unfriendly, and endeavored in every possible way to render his position unpleasant, and to procure his rejection as a professor, by the Board of Trustees, in 1855; (the Board did not meet in 1854.) Dr. R. S. Newton and his "learned brother," Dr. O. E. Newton, busied themselves, not only in circulating reports against Dr. C., and giving out privately that he was a traitor to the school, and that he would soon be expelled from the Faculty, but made frequent complaints against Dr. C. to members of the Faculty, which, when investigated by them, proved to be gross misrepresentations of the facts. In self-defense Dr. Cleveland could not refrain from expressing, occasionally, his opinion of Dr. Newton's scientific deficiencies.

Dr. C., as Professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics, lectured upon the subject of Therapeutics to show the proper use of medicines, and the Faculty, knowing that such instruction was necessary and valuable, and was not adequately given by Dr. Newton, would not censure his course at the request of Dr. N.

Dr. Newton, not content with his own department of instruction, kept up a controversy with Dr. Cleveland on account of his own course of lectures, because Dr. C. would not co-operate with him in advocating and recommending Keith's adulterated medicines; and, not content with private opposition, announced a course of lectures on Materia Medica, at the clinical amphitheater, in which it was privately given out that he would show up the deficiencies of Dr. Cleveland's course. The members of the Faculty attended the first lecture, and the course suddenly aborted—the proposed remarks were not made.

*Dr. Newton's reputation as a quack, was first established by his cancer practice. He gained considerable notoriety by advertising certificates of his cure of cancer, which he professed were made by a secret nostrum. When applied to for his remedy, by physicians, he refused to give it, on the ground that he was under obligations to the amount of \$1,000 to conceal his remedy. Old school physicians would not forgive this use of a cancer nostrum; but it was forgiven by Eclectics, in consequence of Dr. Newton's declarations that he had given up secrecy and taught all that he knew upon the subject, in his lectures at Memphis

To settle the controversy as to the genuineness of the medicines, which Dr. C. was forbidden to condemn, Professors King, Hoyt and Cleaveland, in 1855, made a chemical analysis, which demonstrated beyond doubt that they were base adulterations; but this, instead of procuring an apology from Dr. Newton for his course, only made him vindictive against them for making such an exposure.

A great amount of discord was produced in the school by machinations and gossip, in which it was believed Dr. Newton was concerned. This being traced towards its source, a member of the class, W. M. N., an intimate associate and *protégé* of Dr. Newton, was found guilty, upon trial before the Faculty, of improper conduct, falsehood, and abusive language toward the Professors, and was considered worthy of immediate expulsion. At the request of Dr. Newton, however, he was let off with a public reprimand, and the announcement that any repetition of his conduct would result in expulsion; this was the unanimous action of the Faculty. At the next session he was refused admission. As the conduct which merited expulsion was believed by the Faculty to be instigated by Dr. N., this necessarily increased their disapprobation of his course.

The manoeuvres of Dr. N. did not succeed in injuring the standing of Dr. Cleaveland—on the contrary, the members of the class were strongly impressed by the fact that he had been persecuted and annoyed in the midst of zealous and faithful efforts to perform his duty, and to indicate their approbation and esteem, publicly presented Dr. C. with a case of surgical instruments at the close of his first course of lectures (at the public commencement in Masouic Hall), to the great annoyance of Dr. Newton, who took the liberty of *suppressing the fact* in the report of the commencement exercises, in the Eclectic Medical Journal—a paltry but characteristic stratagem.

Finally, having failed to injure Dr. Cleaveland in the estimation of his colleagues and of the class (and having injured himself in the attempt), he took advantage of the fact that the Board of Trustees had not met, and consequently had not confirmed Dr. Cleaveland's appointment, and attempted, July 2d, 1855, after Dr. C. had delivered two courses, to induce the Board to refuse their sanction. Two members of the Board (Drs. Buchanan and Sherwood) were privately addressed in the most humble and persuasive manner, to induce them to consent to Dr. Cleaveland's dismissal. After exhausting his persuasive powers, HE PLEDGED HIMSELF TO US IN THE MOST SOLEMN AND UNQUALIFIED MANNER, that he would *never deliver another course of lectures* with Dr. Cleaveland as a member of the same Faculty. There were no qualifications, conditions or circumstances to this pledge. It was as distinct, *unqualified*, and, apparently, as sincere a pledge as he could make, and yet, it produced no effect whatever. It inspired a faint hope, it is true, that he might keep his pledge and resign; for we regarded that as the best thing that could happen, but we had seen so much of his insincerity that we regarded the pledge as a mere stratagem to carry his point, and paid no regard to it. The Board would not accede to Dr. Newton's demand, and he quietly gave up the point and went on to lecture again as usual, without a blush or an apology for his violated pledge.

Against Professors J. R. Buchanan, I. G. Jones, J. W. Hoyt, and myself, personally, Dr. N. had no complaint; but they had each observed his course of intrigue and falsehood, and had become, by degrees, familiar with his deficiencies and quackeries, and conscious that his presence was a deep injury to the Institute. He knew enough of their sentiments to feel that he would not be upheld by them, and to feel it necessary to make exertions in other directions to enlist friends and supporters. Hence, his phsyopathic intrigues.

The treacherous course pursued by Dr. Newton against the whole Faculty, was conspicuous in the fact that having been entrusted as treasurer with the management of the financial business of the College, he advised and urged the issue of stock for the payment of dividends in 1853 and 1854. This measure, he assured the Faculty, was perfectly legal, and he, in conjunction with the majority of the stockholders (excepting Dr. L. E. Jones) accepted the arrangement as satisfactory. But, as soon as his conspiracy with Dr. L. E. J. was matured, he took ground that this issue, urged and carried out for three years by himself, was illegal, and that the Faculty were bound to raise the cash for the benefit of Dr. L. E. Jones, and cancel the stock. To perfect his treachery, he actually refused to issue about eight hundred dollars of stock, actually due the Faculty, for money recently advanced.

5. ACTIVE SUPPORT OF QUACKERY.—The efforts of Dr.

Newton to convert the Eclectic Medical Institute into an appendage to a quack manufactory of medicines, constituting so prominent a part of his career, and a leading cause of discord with the Faculty, require a satisfactory exposition, that all may see how much the honor of our profession is involved in this matter. The history of this quackery is as follows:

A few years since, a Mesmeric exhibitor in the city of New York, a man of very little science, undertook to establish a shop, especially for the manufacture and sale of the Eclectic concentrated medicines. This establishment bore the title of Franklin Institute. Such titles given to common shops are generally evidences of quackery and false pretensions. The establishment did not, I believe, realize much, either of character or money, and was succeeded by B. Keith & Co. Mr. Keith (formerly a Thomsonian or Botanic-medical practitioner) appears to have had a natural propensity for sinister movements. He announced the establishment as the American Chemical Institute; advertised extensively, and procured a book to be written, entitled "Positive medical agents," to advertise his business, in which the origin of the new remedies was very carefully concealed. He also announced himself, when expedient, as belonging to the old school organization in sentiment.

His medicines were sent forth as nostrums, their mode of manufacture being concealed, and it was very soon discovered that they were in many cases gross adulterations and impositions. Great complaints were made in every direction of the spurious character of his concentrated medicines,* and the matter at length attracted scientific investigation. The professors of Materia Medica and Chemistry in the Eclectic Medical Institute, and Prof. King, the author of the new Dispensatory, thought it necessary to examine these preparations, as they were extensively advertised and were actively recommended by Dr. Newton.

There was another remarkable circumstance connected with them. It was given out by Dr. Newton that the parties concerned in the manufacture of these medicines at New York, had a large amount of capital, and were determined to establish, on a liberal scale, a splendid medical college, which would co-operate harmoniously with the Eclectic Medical Institute, and form its Faculty chiefly from the Faculty of the Institute. Places were tendered to members of the Faculty, the new college was mentioned in the Eclectic Journal, and it appeared that, by co-operating with Keith's drug business, a brilliant prospect was to be opened for the Faculty, in a new and imposing school. The Faculty, however, were not captivated by empty boasts and promises, and did not believe that a medical school, established for the purpose of aiding a druggist, would be any thing honorable and important; nor were they to be bribed into the support of quackery by any prospective pecuniary benefits. If capital was really pledged to such purposes, they were determined that the Eclectic Medical Institute, and the majority of its Faculty, should have no connection with any such schemes, unless they were truly of an honorable nature. As the Keith medicines appeared to be the foundation of the whole scheme, their first investigation of them dissipated into air the whole of the New York bubble, by showing its rotten foundation—since which, the great New York College has been among the things that *have been dreamed of*.

A regular analysis of the Keith medicines was made by Professors King, Hoyt and Cleaveland. The results were

* The American Medical and Surgical Journal of May and June, 1855, remarked, editorially, (p. 262)

"I have been perplexed and chagrined the past year, because a great quantity of the concentrated remedies were either inert, or proved severe irritants. There was not that uniformity in their action, which had before characterized their therapeutic action. Numerous letters, from many among the brightest lights in the profession, have been received, making inquiry of me, if 'something can not be done to correct the progress of adulterations, and expose the black-hearted, infamous scoundrels, who make *merchandise* of human health, suffering and life; as also, hesitated not to rob all our classes of practitioners of their hard-earned professional characters.'"

This grave and weighty consideration, induced a large number of those of us who have been instrumental in bringing the new remedies into general use, to investigate and expose the nature of these frauds, and the unprincipled perpetrators of them. We have a rich time of it, and have begun to unravel and reveal the secrets, by the unerring result of correct chemical analysis. I am an eye witness to the investigations."

given in the lectures of Prof. C., and an article on the subject, which was offered by Dr. K. to the Eclectic Medical Journal, and refused publication by Dr. Newton, was published in other medical journals. For the same reason Dr. Cleveland had to publish elsewhere the statement first made by himself, from which the following extract is taken:

"Dr. Hill, of the firm of F. D. Hill & Co., of this city, has given me the following slight memoranda. He is to test these agents still further.

"R. Hydrastine, grs. 22. Asclepidin, grs. 40. Hydrastin, grs. 22. Irisin, grs. 30. Lobelin, grs. 40. Gelsemin, grs. 20. Podophyllin, grs. 40. Boiling Alcohol, 98 per cent. above proof, 4 ounces."

"I digested the above for three hours, with repeated agitation. The Podophyllin and Hydrastine are both soluble in boiling Alcohol. The other five articles threw down a copious precipitate. In the Lobelin, I found Magnesia and Lobelia seeds, and a white substance on which the Sulphuric Acid would not act. The following are the weights of the precipitate I obtained from the Alcoholic solutions. From the Hydrastine, 30 grains; Asclepidin, 29 grains; Irisin, 20 grains; Lobelin, 25 grains, and from the Gelsemin, 18 grains. All and each of the precipitates are soluble in Sulphuric Acid.

"Others who have tested these articles, have obtained similar results. Mr. Gordon found that Xanthoxilin yielded 60 per cent. of Magnesia, and that Lobelin yielded 80 per cent. Some of these specimens examined were taken from bottles sent by Keith & Co. to Dr. R. S. Newton. Those tested by Mr. Wayne were sent by the manufacturers to me, as samples of their agents."

As Dr. Newton was determined to pay no regard to chemical analysis, or any other proof of fraud, he soon came into collision with his colleagues. Knowing very little of chemistry, but familiar with the arts of the scurrilous demagogue, he seemed to suppose that a liberal discharge of abusive language would more than match the simple facts of chemical science. The contest began by an attack upon Dr. King's Dispensatory, in the Express and Eclectic Journal, and an assault upon the editors of the College Journal, as guilty of falsehood and depravity (March, 1856).

Dr. King, tired as he was of association with Dr. Newton, refused to continue any further his course of lectures, until the difficulty was in some manner settled, by resignation or compromise. A meeting of the Faculty was called on the afternoon of the same day, and while the Faculty were thus engaged, a meeting of the class was held, and resolutions were passed, strongly sustaining Dr. King, and hoping that, whatever else might be done, his services would be retained in the College. At the Faculty meeting Dr. King laid down his ultimatum, and after considerable discussion, Dr. Newton acceded to his demands. Dr. King also insisted (having very little confidence in Dr. Newton's integrity) that the matter should be put in writing and signed by the parties. The agreement was reduced to writing on the spot, by Dr. Buchanan, and signed by Drs. Newton and King. Dr. Newton also agreed to retract and apologize for his assault upon the editors of the College Journal, and a specific form of apology was written out, and, after considerable discussion as to its language, agreed upon by the parties; which apology was subsequently published in the Eclectic Journal, but with a little alteration from the form which had solemnly been agreed upon as a settlement of the matter—a paltry trick, which was considered to be in keeping with Dr. N.'s whole course. His charge of falsehood was malicious; he knew it to be untrue, but he did not appear to understand how an honorable man should apologize for gross injustice.

Extract from the Minutes of the Faculty.

"The following is a copy of an 'Agreement of Dr. R. S. Newton and Dr. John King':

"1. Dr. Newton to abstain from publishing in the Express, and Eclectic Medical Journal, any thing which has a personal bearing against members of the Eclectic Medical Institute, or against the College itself.

"2. Dr. Newton is not to use the influence of the Express and Eclectic Medical Journal, to advocate and uphold the so-called National Eclectic Medical Convention, or Association, which is to meet in New York next June, and which has been repudiated by the Faculty of the Institute.

"3. Dr. Newton is not to keep before the public as asso-

ciate editor any gentleman known to be connected with the manufacture and sale of nostrums.

"R. S. NEWTON,
"J. KING."

"Prof. R. S. Newton also agreed to make the amende honorable, by recalling his remarks made in the Eclectic Medical Journal, concerning the editors of the College Journal, and the article headed 'New Remedies—How to test them,' in both the Eclectic Medical Journal and the Express. He also agreed, that as the obnoxious article of Dr. Grover Coe, relative to King's Am. Ec. Dispens., was already printed on one side of the Express, to disavow and repudiate the incorrect statements therein made, on the other side.

JOHN KING, Secretary."

Remarks of the Editors of the College Journal.

"In justice to Prof. Newton, lest he should appear in too inconsistent an attitude in view of all the facts, we deem it proper to state, that during the discussion which resulted in the final action given above, he expressed as much hostility to the so-called Nat. Ec. Med. Ass., as any of us, and that his publications in its favor were meant as strokes of policy, whereby we might gain influence in the Association, have its next meeting held in Cincinnati, and then appear in sufficient strength 'to kill it.'

"Respect to the fidelity of history, also requires us to call special attention to the fact, that notwithstanding the solemn pledges given to his colleagues, as above copied from the minutes, he did, in the next number of the Express, reprint his former article in favor of the Nat. Ec. Med. Ass., and did not 'disavow,' nor 'repudiate,' any of the 'incorrect statements' of 'Dr. Grover Coe.'

"J. R. BUCHANAN, M. D.

"J. KING, M. D.

"W. SHERWOOD, M. D.

"J. W. HOTT, M. D.

"C. H. CLEVELAND, M. D."

The Faculty were disgusted, but not astonished, to find that the whole written pledge was entirely disregarded, and speedily violated, by re-publishing in the Express the very article indorsing the N. Y. meeting, which had been thus repudiated; and the same abusive articles against Dr. King, without any correction. This gross violation of the written pledge, Dr. N. has since attempted to excuse, on the ground that a city newspaper, just started, contained an editorial article reflecting upon himself, that copies had been sent to the College for distribution, and that the Faculty were accessory to the proceeding. The members of the Faculty had really nothing to do with this; on the contrary, when they saw the newspapers, they recommended the gentlemen who received, not to distribute them, as they did not wish such matters spread before the class. It was the misfortune of Dr. Newton, that his conduct in the Martha Washington business, and other matters, had long been known to the editor of the Freeman, and he deemed it his editorial duty to speak out. Having been well acquainted with members of the class he heard the news of the College, and thought it worth publishing. This false and flimsy pretext of Dr. Newton, for violating a pledge, needs no comment.

The following resolutions were adopted at the same meeting of the Faculty (March 6th, 1856), in order to define the position of the Institute, before the public, which had been somewhat compromised by Dr. Newton's publications:

"At a meeting of the Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute, held on March 6th, 1856, Professors J. R. Buchanan, C. H. Cleveland, R. S. Newton, W. Sherwood, Z. Freeman and J. King, being present, the following resolutions were unanimously passed:

"Resolved, That the Faculty of this Institute do not recognize any existing organization in the United States, as 'The National Eclectic Medical Association,' and will not authorize any person or persons to represent us in any body so styled, as at present constituted.

"Resolved, That this Faculty fully indorse 'King's Eclectic Dispensatory,' believing it to be as free from error as any other similar work, and believing the author to be fully capable and willing to correct and improve the work as truth and progressive science may require.

"Resolved, That with reference to pharmaceutical preparations, this Faculty require, as a prerequisite to their being employed or recommended by us as therapeutic agents, that the following rules shall be observed:

"First, A method must be made public by which each agent may be produced.

"Second, Where agents are incapable of being tested by chemistry, the names and proportions of all the ingredients entering into their composition, or used in their preparation, must be made public.

"Third, Agents purporting to be pure alkaloids, resins, acids, etc., must not be adulterated, or combined with other substances, unless the fact be stated on the labels.

J. K. BUCHANAN, *Dean.*

"J. KING, *Secretary.*"

Drs. Newton and Freeman did not venture to oppose these resolutions before the Faculty. Dr. F. voted for them, and Dr. N. heard, without objection, the remark when the vote was taken, that they were *unanimously passed*. Nevertheless, they perceived the position in which they were placed, and *disavowed* supporting the resolutions, when they were published; thus, placing themselves distinctly on the platform of quackery.

The treacherous and inconsistent course which they pursued, in reference to the pseudo Eclectic Convention, was very characteristic. In May, 1851, Dr. Buchanan, then President of the National Eclectic Medical Association, perceiving that it was impossible to gather, in any convention or meeting, a national representation of the Profession, and that each meeting would be nothing more than a gathering of the physicians of the neighborhood, with perhaps a dozen from a distance, recommended such a course as honesty and truth required under such circumstances, viz., the omission of the title "*national*," which was untrue and deceptive; "leaving each Eclectic Medical Association to be designated by the locality at which it meets." This policy Dr. Newton agreed to sustain when he attended the meeting at Pittsburgh, but it was not adopted. Probably he did not sustain it.

Subsequently, the leading editorial of the Eclectic Journal, July, 1853, contained the following sentiments, in which Dr. N. fully coincided, although he was not the author of the article (page 311).

"True, we have, through courtesy, given to these meetings the title which they assumed as *national*; but we would now say that these poetical liberties in the use of language, should terminate; and we can not recognize any local meeting of physicians (not large enough to fill a private parlor) as a national assembly. Whether such meetings are held in New England, Florida, or California, we shall recognize them for precisely what they are, and nothing more. Meetings at the eastern border of our republic are not central to the Eclectic medical profession, and consequently they merely serve the purpose of enabling a few gentlemen residing in that quarter, to present themselves and their personal views or wishes before the public as national matters, emanating from the representatives of the entire profession. * * *

"In fact, the National Eclectic Medical Association has substantially ceased to exist. The constitution and by-laws are *here*; and the parties who are carrying on the ceremonies and keeping up the name, are probably not aware of the rules of the society, or that their proceedings are informal, if not a legal nonentity.

"We have no objection to the meeting of the friends of medical reform anywhere and everywhere; on the contrary, we deeply regret that our conventions and associations are not kept up with more spirit and extensive co-operation; but we do object to having small *sectional* meetings trumpeted abroad with national titles. Such operations resemble too closely the policy of Dr. Beach, and we hope to see no more of it.

"P. S. Since writing the above, we have been informed, to our surprise, by one who had conversed with a member of the Philadelphia meeting, that it was ridiculously small—so small that we can scarcely credit the fact that such a meeting could have assumed the title of a National Association. If our informant was correct, we think the gentlemen concerned would have acted with more dignity by laughing over the failure and adjourning *sine die* on the spot."

In July, 1855, Dr. Newton published, in the Eclectic Journal, the following protest, to which he, and others of Faculty, had previously given assent, but appended to it a qualifying postscript of his own, by which he individually repudiated the idea of calling the meeting a national association.

"AMERICAN ECLECTICISM — A PROTEST.

"In the New York Tribune of the 6th and 7th of June, I observe a report of what is somewhat facetiously called the 'National Eclectic Medical Association,' consisting of an assembly, according to the reporter's count of the votes, of twenty-five medical gentlemen.

"It will be presumed, of course, from its high sounding title, that this assembly bore some resemblance, in its character, to the National Medical Association, and is to be considered an authorized national representative of not less than three thousand physicians, who are known as American Eclectics. As such an impression would be erroneous and unjust, permit me to remark that the so-called National Eclectic Medical Association is in no sense a national affair, and does not represent the views or sentiments of American Eclectics.

"It appears to have consisted of a miscellaneous gathering, in which Eclecticism, Botanico-Medicalism, Thomsonism, Physio-Medicalism, and other indescribable forms of independent radicalism, were harmoniously jumbled together. As for being represented before the medical public by this accidental *olla podrida* meeting, I beg leave to enter a very decided protest, not only in behalf of myself as an individual and a medical professor, but as *Dean*, in behalf of the Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute, who do not desire to have the little reputation they may have enjoyed rendered entirely ludicrous by the position in which they would be placed, if the New York meeting were recognized as their representative.

"The Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati is the parent school, in which the title of Eclectic was first adopted, as a designation of liberal American principles in medicine; anterior to which time, the title of American Eclectic was unknown.

"In this school a majority of those educated American Eclectics, who are *fully acquainted with the American system*, have received their education—the number of matriculants in the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati, since its establishment in 1845, having been 2,143.

"We hope that the press and the public will not be deceived by the high sounding but baseless title of National Eclectic Medical Association, or attach an undue importance to such unauthorized or promiscuous meetings, or hold others responsible for their proceedings, who distinctly and totally disavow all responsibility for and connection with the New York meeting, with which they are not and will not be professionally identified.

"JOS. K. BUCHANAN.

"Cincinnati, June 22, 1855."

"We copy the foregoing from the Daily Columbian, of this city. So far as we are concerned individually, and as a member of the Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute, we protest *only* against a few physicians claiming to represent all the Eclectic profession, by using the title of the 'National Eclectic Medical Association.' That body of men had the right, in their own name, to make such laws, rules and regulations for themselves, as best suited them, and to such a course we have no objections. Yet, we are of the opinion that their action should be regarded by the profession as the doings of a local society, and not those of a national body. N."

Yet, after this protest, in 1855, Dr. Newton found himself, in 1856, desperately in want of friends and supporters, and determined to reverse his course, to secure the co-operation of the New York meeting, with its spurious title, which he had already condemned as an imposition upon the public. The spurious pretensions of that meeting were perfectly in harmony with his own position and character, and he knew that it was available for any humbug purpose that he desired. Hence, he commenced advertising and puffing it in the Eclectic Medical Journal and Express, thus repudiating the policy and position of the Institute, as well as the principles of common honesty. This course of duplicity and intrigue, designed to array a spurious organization against the Faculty, aroused their attention, and the result was as shown above, that Dr. Newton, under the moral force of their indignation, which his conduct had excited, was made not only to pledge himself, but to sign a written pledge to change his course, and cease to uphold the New York imposition—a pledge which he violated without scruple or hesitation.

The character of this intrigue is further developed in the following article on "conglomeration," from the College Journal, and in the indorsement of the convention by the Botanico-medical organ of Dr. Curtis, as follows:

"The National Eclectic Medical Association, which convened in New York last June, embraced within its folds such staunch Physio-medicalists as H. M. Sweet, I. M. Comings, J. D. Friend, P. Stotesbury, and H. A. Archer. The Convention had a rough synopsis of the Baltimore Platform presented to it, and, upon full deliberation, adopted that platform as the expression of its own sentiments. This was a result so wholly unlooked for, that

Prof. Buchanan, in the name of the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati, publicly denied the validity of the Convention, and repudiated their proceedings and resolutions. Recently the Faculty of this Institute, in a formal meeting, refused to recognize the existence of any such Eclectic Association, and determined to not be represented in the 'so-called' one which is to meet in New York City next month.

"To our mind, this is the most open and consistent thing which this Faculty has done for many years. The New York meeting adopted the opinion, that 'Irritation, Fever and Inflammation are not diseases, but Physiological efforts to remove Disease.' This is a doctrine to which the Eclectics of this city, and of the whole West, are most positively opposed; and it constitutes the great ground of difference between them and the TRUE medical reformer. We were not surprised, therefore, to see Dr. Buchanan repudiate the convention which sanctioned any such sentiment. * * * * *

"We hope that our eastern friends will now see the propriety of drawing a distinction between truth and error, and cease to barter their birth-right by paying court to the term Eclectic. Buchanan and his confederates originated that name, and have the best right of explaining what it means. They have, in a negative sense, done this by repudiating the Convention of 1855, held in New York. They never have and never will stand on the platform there adopted, and it seems to us the height of folly for the friends of that platform to be willing to 'welcome with open arms' a set of men so proscriptive and so completely Allopathic as the Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati. If principles are to be valued as any better than straws, let those who have faith in the Baltimore Platform stand firmly by themselves, and not again lend their names to the farce of reiterating the truths of that platform in the name of Eclecticism."

The above explains why Dr. Newton amalgamates so completely with the Physopaths. Their leading doctrine is the doctrine of his book and lectures. He has abandoned the fundamental doctrines which have been taught by all the leaders of American Eclecticism, and substantially united in sentiment with the most inveterate and rancorous opponents of the Eclectic Medical Institute!! These doctrines were taught in his lectures before they were observed by the Faculty; and when he attempted by a cunning stratagem to commit the Institute, through his Journal and the pseudo-Eclectic meeting, to this union with Physopathy, the Faculty thought it necessary to renew their repudiation of such schemes, as well as of the adulterated medicines, upheld by the Eclectic Journal, and favored by the pseudo-Eclectic, Physopathic convention. The following notice of the subject, from the College Journal, explains more fully this intrigue.

"CONGLOMERATION.

"In science we object to the confusion of technical terms—in pharmacy, to adulterated drugs—in literature and professional life, to the general conglomeration of distinct and incompatible elements.

"We take it for granted, that no honorable physician can either engage in or sanction pharmaceutical frauds, and consider it equally clear, that no true Eclectic can desire to confound in the public mind, the position of the Eclectic Medical Institute and its graduates, with that of the physopathy, the leaders of which, in Cincinnati and elsewhere, have, ever since the early labors of Professors Morrow and I. G. Jones, at Worthington, been among the most malignant and untiring opponents of the Institute and its Faculty. Without meaning any disrespect whatever, to worthy physicians who have been misled by the physopathic views of medical science (with whom we have no collision), we can not forget the amount of charlatanism of the quasi-Thomsonian party in this State, as shown in the course of its principal demagogue. If more respectable individuals have since come forward, they have not succeeded in repudiating the leadership of their pioneer, and the character which he has given to his faction.

"With these views we have felt compelled to protest against the New York conglomeration of between twenty and thirty individuals, which assumed to itself, without right, the title of 'National Eclectic Medical Association,' and which was recently claimed by the *Physio-Medical Journal*, as an affair of its own stripe.

"Recently, we observe, a few individuals have met in New York, June 10th, under the title of the 'New York State Botanic Medical Society.' How many were present we are not informed. We merely note the fact that they met in the room of the Physopathic school (the Metropol-

itan), that Samuel Tuthill, M. D., was president, and that 'Professors Newton, Freeman and Sanders, of Cincinnati,' are recorded as having been present and 'invited to participate in the deliberations of the meeting.'

"We observe also, in the proceedings of this society, that the following report was presented in reference to Keith & Co.'s concentrated adulterations:

"The committee on concentrated medicine reported as follows:

"Your committee to whom the subject of concentrated medicines was referred, would make the following report. We have examined the preparations of B. Keith & Co., of this city, and have been much pleased with the courtesy shown us, in the full and clear explanations given us of his method of concentration, and with the extent of his business, showing conclusively, that there is an increasing demand for the indigenous remedies of the country. The inertness and worthlessness of some of the preparations which have been manufactured by Keith & Co., are now fully accounted for, by the isolated separation of some of the principles, and supposing that the medical virtue resided in certain portions. where now, by later discoveries, they tell us they unite all the parts of the plant, and thus the practitioner gets just what he wants, viz: the whole article in a concentrated form. If the representations of B. Keith & Co. are correct, and their establishment is making discoveries every day in the preparation of our remedies, we can but feel a confidence in their manufacture, and would express the hope that the patronage which has been so liberally bestowed by our profession, will be continued to them."

"This learned report, which communicates no information whatever in relation to concentrated remedies, but consists entirely of an apology and a puff for Keith & Co., probably prepared by some one personally interested, was just the apology and indorsement which that miserable imposition required. Whether Messrs. Newton & Co., succeeded in getting a similar indorsement of Keith & Co., from their pretended Eclectic convention, we know not, as a full report of its proceedings has not yet reached us—but we anticipated nothing more from the first, than that this pseudo-Eclectic affair was to be used as a puffing machine for these pharmaceutical frauds and other spurious enterprises. The above report is itself a concentrated fraud. The 'inertness and worthlessness' which they confess (for it is substantially the report of Keith & Co.), and which they knew was due to magnesia and other adulterations, they would ascribe to their having made their remedies too pure. How very stupid they must suppose the medical profession to be! With all the faults of the old school party in medicine, they never tolerate any such corrupt and bare-faced charlatanism as this. The parties who attempt it are compelled to stand outside of all respectable associations, and it is an insult to Eclectic physicians, to suppose that they, as a profession, can be brought to tolerate any thing so degrading.

"So much for the *N. Y. State Botanic Medical Society*, which gives this precious report as a part of its proceedings, without protest or rebuke!

"The next day the pseudo-Eclectic convention met, consisting, we presume, of the same parties. Drs. Newton and Freeman are present each day. Dr. S. Tuthill is president of both meetings, and the names of their officers and members as given, show that both affairs were substantially the same.

Drs. Newton & Co. are entirely welcome to amalgamate with physopathy, and to unite their amalgamated materials in a rich compound, with the adulterations of Keith & Co.; and the latter are equally welcome to win the patronage of old-schoolism, by claiming professional affinity, and by concealing the origin of the Eclectic medicines. It is all a very amusing piece of private intrigue, conglomeration and fraud, entirely worthy of the parties concerned; but we most decidedly protest against the respectable name of Eclecticism, being in any way whatever mixed up in such a hotch-potch of charlatanism.

"P. S.—We have just seen the proceedings of the abortive, so-called National Eclectic Association, in which we discover not a single contribution to medical science. The only thing resembling a medical contribution, was a verbal narrative by one gentleman, of the common treatment of two cases of erysipelas, by 'muriated tincture of iron.' It is obvious, therefore, that the meeting had no scientific objects in view, and as it was nearly a failure in every point of view, we should not occupy any more space in noticing it, except for the reason that as 'straws show which way the wind blows,' small matters may be quite significant.

"The leading business of quack puffing was well performed, as Dr. Newton dwelt largely upon the value of Keith's concentrated [adulterated] remedies, which he especially preferred to those of all other manufacturers, and Dr. Freeman followed in a similar strain, telling how he used them. As for the rest of their proceedings, the members talked about the progress of reform, complained of the non-attendance of persons whom they needed to make out a respectable number, and adopted a report on medical publications, which merely announced the successful publication of the *Electric Journal*, the *Worcester Journal*, and several *physopathic journals*—from which we infer that they all claimed as belonging to one clique. But it is a little remarkable, as the *College Journal* was omitted from the group (for which we are sincerely thankful), that they did not strike out the *Worcester Journal*, which refuses to recognize Keith's adulterations as honest medicines, and tries to uphold the respectability of the profession.

We think that the fusion of spurious Eclecticism and physopathy is pretty plainly made out. In order to finish the maneuver handsomely, a report was adopted, which exhibits a *great deal of very short-sighted cunning*, in which the *learned gentlemen* in aiming a blow at Dr. Buchanan, cut their own heads entirely off, by repudiating the platform of doctrines upon which the American Eclectic physicians now stand, and have stood, ever since their first promulgation. Their report, or rather resolution spoke as follows:

"*Whereas*, Certain documents written by Jos. R. Buchanan have found their way into the public prints, purporting to emanate from the press of the National Eclectic Medical Association, we beg leave to inform the medical profession and the community generally, that he is not, nor has he been for the last five years, a member of this Association, having lost his membership by neglecting to attend the meetings of the Association, and failing to pay his yearly dues during that period; and

"*Whereas*, The course he has pursued has been indorsed by others, whose claims to our confidence and to authority are quite as untenable as his own: therefore,

"*Resolved*, That we caution the profession and the public against receiving anything emanating from said sources, as expressive of the principles or policy of the Eclectic medical profession."

"A more paltry trick than the above was never contrived by a demagogue. The resolution apparently warns the public against spurious documents, issued by Dr. Buchanan, in behalf of a National Eclectic Association, of which he is not a member. *There are no such documents* in existence—none such have ever existed. The Association has not, and never had, a press; and Dr. Buchanan has written no documents 'purporting to emanate' from the National Eclectic Medical Association, except what are contained in the proceedings of that body, at the time that Dr. Morrow participated with him in its meetings. The documents of that body, written by Dr. Buchanan, were unanimously received by American Eclectics, and still embody the sentiments of the profession. Dr. Morrow and Dr. Buchanan, in perfect union of sentiment, agreed in the principles of the Eclectic movement. They were recognized as its leaders—they attended in conjunction the first three meetings of the convention held in Cincinnati, and at its last meeting, Dr. Buchanan was nominated by Dr. Morrow as the President of the Association for the ensuing year, and elected to that office. Dr. Morrow died a few months after this, and neither Dr. M. nor Dr. B. ever attended another meeting. Consequently, in repudiating everything written by Dr. Buchanan, these gentlemen have through either ignorance or design, repudiated the authentic expression of the principles of Eclecticism, adopted and sustained, not only by Dr. Morrow and Dr. Buchanan, but by all who have heretofore been concerned in founding and sustaining the Eclectic movement.

"This is all very well; for the miscellaneous clique that met in New York (a small doctor's office would have held them all) was not an Eclectic meeting, but a hotch-potch of physopaths, spurious Eclectics and unknown individuals, and ought to have a platform of their own, after the Baltimore pattern. What we object to is the *impudence*, the *impudence*, of getting together a little coterie, chiefly physopathic, and attempting to palm it upon the public as a National Eclectic Medical Association, when it did not embrace ten Eclectics out of the three thousand in America. They did not recognize the meeting, and would not attend it.

"A VOICE FROM GEORGIA.—Since writing the foregoing article, our attention has been re-called to a resolution adopted by the Reform Medical Society of Georgia, at its

late annual meeting, which, coming as it does from an Association allied in professional views to the New York society, stands out in bold and refreshing relief by the side of the report adopted by the latter. It is but justice to our Southern neighbors, to show that they have on this subject, a highly creditable record. It is as follows:

"On motion the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That this Society is convinced, not only from analyses conducted in this Institution, but from their use by our practitioners, that the concentrated medicines sold from the American Chemical Society, in New York, and prepared by B. Keith & Co., are spurious and adulterated, and entirely unworthy our confidence; and that we recommend to this society to discard them in their practice."

It may appear singular that a Faculty should have thought it necessary to adopt formal resolutions against spurious conventions, nostrums and adulterated medicines, and still more singular that two of the Faculty should protest against being considered as supporting such resolutions. But, though singular, it was true: Dr. Newton had exerted all his moral energy to compel the Faculty and class to go with him in the support of adulterated medicines, and he could not consistently support the resolutions by which they were repudiated, while some feeling of shame prevented him from openly opposing them. The Faculty knowing the history of these frauds, could not submit to having the Institute and the cause of Eclecticism identified with them. Their whole history was discreditable.

The success of Eclectic remedies, and, especially, of the concentrated preparations, inspired the idea of making a fine commercial speculation by bringing them before the profession at large and concealing their American Eclectic origin. B. Keith, a botanico-medical practitioner, undertook this delicate task, to accomplish which, he procured a book to be written by Dr. Bickley, (the name of its author not appearing on the title-page,) in which the concentrated remedies were described and lauded with a careful avoidance of any reference to the fact that they were already in extensive use as the Eclectic remedies. This stroke of policy was not pleasing to the Faculty, and physicians generally of Eclectic sentiments, and was decidedly condemned by the majority of the Faculty.

But a much more serious objection to Keith, & Co., was found in the character of their medicines. Aside from other objections, it was found that they were extensively adulterated, chiefly with *magnesia*. Dr. Cleveland, as professor of *Materia Medica*, criticised and discussed the character of every remedy upon which he lectured, and in reference to the concentrated medicines, he did not hesitate to mention the fraudulent character of those manufactured in New York by B. Keith & Co. This created violent opposition from Dr. Newton, to whose department this subject did not belong, but who, for some mysterious reason, was singularly interested in the success of B. Keith & Co., whose preparations he continually recommended, and whom he defended with a Damon and Pythias friendship. The analyses by which these frauds were detected, chemically, were of an unquestionable character. Professors King, Cleveland and Hoyt, all detected the presence of *magnesia*, and in some of the articles (especially Hydrastin, Apocynin, Lobelin, Hyo-ciamin, Gelsemin, Aconitine,) in quantities of from 75 to 80 per cent., in medicines represented to be pure concentrated alkaloids and resinoids,—and published their analysis. Dr. Newton, instead of engaging in the same chemical analysis, for his own satisfaction, or acknowledging that a fraud had been detected, devoted his energies to covering up, concealing and denying this fraud, thus virtually accusing his colleagues of imposition. Neither Dr. Newton nor B. Keith ever met the question of adulteration directly, as honest men—they never appealed to the unerring test of chemistry, or made any such effort to vindicate themselves as honorable men would have done. A continued quarrel with Dr. Cleveland—a continued circulation of petty calumny—a refusal to allow the facts to appear in the *Electric Medical Journal*—a continued puffing of B. Keith & Co., and the establishment of an agency in Dr. Newton's office for Keith's preparations (in the name of Dr. Newton's clerk,) exhibited the determination of Dr. Newton to sustain right or wrong the detected imposition and fraud. He was willing to sink himself to this professional degradation, knowing that he was thereby destroying what respectability he retained; and the Faculty were grieved to observe a man in the position of professor evincing such moral obtuseness, and exerting its injurious influence upon young men in the class, as well as dishonoring the Institute before the public; hence the necessity which they

felt for publicly defining the position of the College in reference to nostrums and adulterations.

Additional evidence of fraud, to any extent, would have had no influence upon Dr. Newton. The adulteration of Keith's medicines was detected, chemically, by physicians in Georgia as well as Cincinnati, and the result published. When a visit was made to Cincinnati by B. Keith himself, and specimens of his medicine left with Dr. King, declaring that they were pure, and that he could give \$10,000 if any adulteration was detected in them, it was supposed they might be pure, but when analyzed by a good chemist, they also proved to be adulterated. Specimens which had been obtained from the agency at Dr. Newton's office were analyzed by E. S. Wayne, of Cincinnati,—a chemist of considerable reputation—and similar adulterations detected, which were published in the College Journal for January, 1856. This accumulated evidence would have satisfied any honorable physician who might have been imposed upon, and if Dr. Newton had not been an interested party to the fraud, he should have thrown away the agency at once and denounced the imposition. But instead of this, additional private gossip and billingsgate articles in the Eclectic Journal constituted the response. Mr. Wayne was personally abused. Dr. King's and Dr. Cleveland's writings were assailed, and a determination evinced to fight with desperation for the fraud, but not a particle of evidence was adduced to vindicate the guilty parties, whose course is considered equivalent to a confession of guilt.

It was thus regarded by the Worcester Journal of Medicine, which, in an editorial article on "concentrated remedies," used the following language:

"We have heretofore referred to the *Positive Medical Agents*, or medicinal concentrations of various herbs and plants, prepared by Messrs. Keith & Co., at what was the *American Chemical Institute*, New York. We have expressed our honest disapprobation of the secrecy maintained in their manufacture, a secrecy which almost infallibly indicates the worst kind of quackery. We have regretted, too, to be obliged to express our doubts as to the purity and real therapeutic value of the medicines prepared by that firm. We have also admitted into our columns some articles professing to give a chemical analysis of some of their preparations, showing them, at least in some instances, to be greatly, monstrously, and wickedly adulterated. Our own observations and our own analysis have, to some extent, confirmed the observations of others, and have compelled us, much to our own regret, to join in the common censure of Keith & Co., for their attempt to palm off miserable adulterations for pure articles, upon an unsuspecting public. * * *

"As conductors of a public journal devoted to medicine, we shall never shrink from the faithful discharge of that duty. Nothing would give us more pleasure than to be able to speak in high terms in commendation of the concentrated preparations of Keith & Co. But with the suspicions thrown around them, ripening into certainty from repeated analysis, that they are base adulterations, a splendid humbug, we can not do it. We can hardly conceive of any greater wickedness than the sale, to *medical men*, of base, worthless, perhaps dangerous medicines, which they are expecting to deal out to the sick. The advertising quack is a saint in comparison with him who would thus pollute the every fountains of those medical means which are to be placed in the hands of scientific men. These are reasons, which we think amply sufficient, for the course we have taken in relation to the preparations of Keith & Co. * * *

"One remarkable fact stands out prominently, if not fatally, in relation to this whole matter. Though boldly challenged and frequently accused of adulterating their preparations, Messrs. Keith, & Co. have never seen fit to make a distinct and positive denial of the charge. They have never bid defiance to chemical analysis, and challenged investigation. Nor have their friends done it for them. If they are innocent, why have they failed to do it? With the current of public opinion setting strongly against them, why have they failed to do it? Their silence on this subject is of the most ominous kind."

As for the abusive attack upon Mr. Wayne for publishing his analysis, the Worcester Journal remarks that "it aims to ridicule Mr. Wayne, and utterly fails to meet the important point of a direct denial of adulterations on the part of Keith & Co. And worse than all, it bears the marks of having been got up for the occasion and for the pay!"

An attempt to defend these adulterations by "Dr. Grover Coe," (which is the *nomme de plume* of J. M. San-

ders,) elicited the following remarks from the Worcester Journal for June, 1856:

"ADULTERATIONS CONFESSED.—We have received from Dr. Grover Coe, another missive in relation to the concentrated preparations of B. Keith & Co., which will be found in another place in this number of our Journal. But we regret to say, that in every essential particular, it is a total failure. Instead of taking a frank and manly course—instead of making a direct reply to the oft-repeated charges of adulteration against that firm, the author has attempted to divert public attention from himself and his employers, by preferring similar charges against another gentleman. In doing this, however, he has indirectly, and perhaps unintentionally, admitted the truth of the charges. * * *

"We respectfully submit that it is an imposition upon the public to offer for sale, as reliable medicine, as a pure chemical principle, a miserable *melange* of gum, resin, organic acids, extractive matter, vegetable alkalies, and other unknown substances, including 'reagents' formed during the process of manufacture, without any intimation that such is the case! Any body can run his herbs through a percolator with alcohol, acids, water, or alkaline solutions—evaporate to dryness, pulverize, and bottle; and thus compete, in the manufacture of reliable medicines, with 'the *ablest* chemical ability in this country!' What then avails all that 'chemical ability,' if it can do no more than the humblest and most ignorant 'Indian doctor' with his 'rutes and yarbs?' But this is not all. This profound 'chemical ability' seems to stand below even the 'Indian doctor' himself, and is obliged to leave, in combination with the 'active principles of plants,' a part of its stable salt, its magnesia, its chlorophyll, and other substances which 'can not be got rid of.' We thank Dr. Coe for this confession. * * *

"They will allow us to suggest, that they hereafter throw aside, at least, a large part of this chemical puttering with reference to medicine—bring out articles that are fixed in their physical character and uniform in their strength; and send these out for trial and examination, but never send them forth without a full explanation of their mode of preparation, together with all the knowledge they possess of their therapeutic properties. This is always essential in new medicinal preparations. In old preparations, like morphia or quinia, if the alkaloid is really obtained, the mode of obtaining is not of so much consequence. But in those that are comparatively new, and especially in the confessed *melange* of B. Keith & Co., this is one of the most important things for the profession to understand."

Prof. J. N. Loomis, of the Macon School, Georgia, reported (February, 1856), that concentrated medicines which he had analyzed, including those of B. Keith & Co., contained from 75 to 80 per cent. of foreign matter. He condemns these impositions as follows: "It is not to be wondered at that men should lose confidence in such base fabrications, purporting to be concentrated remedies. We should denominate them *concentrated swindles*, for we know not a more unmitigated, *unmixed* swindle in the history of commerce."

In the September No. of Vol. 27, that standard work, the American Journal of Pharmacy, published at Philadelphia, under the authority of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, (an honorable and influential society, not a mere *sham* or a *private shop*, like the so-called American Chemical Institute of B. Keith & Co.), the second article is the analysis by Mr. Wayne of the concentrated preparations of B. Keith & Co., which demonstrates them to be gross impositions. Of their *Hyoscinium*, the writer states:

"The analysis of this substance proved it to be not as it is represented, a resinous product obtained from the *Hyoscinium Niger*, but to be carbonate of magnesia, upon which tincture of *Hyoscinium* has been poured, the alcohol evaporated, and the resulting mass reduced to powder, the bright green color of which is due to the chlorophyll taken up from the leaves by the alcohol. It contains little or no resin, the fatty greenish substances, chlorophyll alone being separated upon the evaporation of the tincture obtained in the first experiment."

Of their *Hydrastin* he says: "It was heated like the *Hyoscinium*, and found to contain 20.25 grains of carbonate of magnesia, out of 25 grains used in the experiment." "This resinoid, like the former, the analysis proves to be nothing more than carbonate of magnesia, upon which tincture of *Hydrastis* has been proved, the alcohol allowed to evaporate, and the mass then powdered."

Of their *Gelsemin*, he says: "It was heated as the two former substances, and proved to be, like them, carbonate

of magnesia, upon which a tincture had been poured." "The weight of carbonate of magnesia obtained from 25 grains was 21.25 grains."

"The other resins I have examined (he continues), and with the same comparative results; the only difference being a slight variation in the amount of carb. magnesia found. I have examined in all, eighteen specimens of the products of the American Chemical Institute, called resins and alkaloids, and have found but four specimens to be as represented."

Can the ethics of the medical profession be so far corrupted as to tolerate such frauds as the above—frauds which are utterly without defence? If so, our profession is degenerate indeed, and we shall expect to see Brandreth, Holloway, and the host of minor quacks, affiliated with medical schools and medical journals.

Is it any apology for such impositions, if the parties, warned by an exposure, are induced to sell pure medicines in other cases, or to vigilant customers? By no means; those who engage in such a course, are never to be trusted. The first exposition did not arrest the frauds, nor have we any evidence that they have yet been discontinued. A party arrested for manufacturing and passing counterfeit money, would not find it any mitigation of his offense if

he should prove that he had a considerable amount of good money also.

The expression "concentrated swindles," was very properly applied to these preparations by the Georgia Professor. Adulterated medicines are not to be regarded as mere commercial frauds, like sanded sugar and watered brandy. Nor are they of the same grade as counterfeit bank notes, which merely rob their victim of so much money; for, in addition to robbing the purchaser of his money, they render all prescriptions uncertain, and endanger life and health in patients, to an extent beyond pecuniary computation. If the forger of bank notes is esteemed infamous, a double infamy attaches to the manufacturer of fraudulent, adulterated medicines, and to all who are accessory to his crime.

In the present instance, the accessory not only fights the battles of his principal, but employs for that purpose a periodical, called the Eclectic Medical Journal; and, unless the Eclectic Physicians of the United States repudiate that Journal, by withdrawing their patronage, it will do much to fasten upon the entire profession the charge of being friends and sympathisers with the vilest form of quackery that has ever dishonored human nature.

VERACITY OF DR. NEWTON;

AN EXHIBITION OF HIS HABITUAL VIOLATION OF TRUTH, AND A BRIEF NOTICE OF HIS CALUMNIES.

To the numerous petty calumnies and misrepresentations of Dr. Newton, so industriously and widely circulated, there is one general answer, viz: that Dr. NEWTON is UNWORTHY OF BELIEF, and consequently his calumnies, unless supported by some respectable testimony, are worthy only of contempt. That his assertions are worthless, I propose to show by reference to some of the most marked examples of his disregard to truth, in matters of public notoriety.

EXAMPLES OF HARD SWEARING.

The very first step of Dr. Newton, in litigation with the Faculty—his petition for an injunction, opens with a startling falsehood in the first paragraph—an assertion which he knew to be false when he wrote it. The dividend which is guaranteed to stockholders upon the stock of the Institute is from six to ten per cent., according to the amount of the dividend fund. Dr. Newton, having been for several years a stockholder and Treasurer of the Institute, having given more attention than any other individual to its financial affairs, was perfectly familiar with the rate of the interest or dividend which he paid out as Treasurer and received as stockholder. Nevertheless, in petitioning for an injunction against the officers of the Institute, and demanding money (\$1,000) to be paid over to him, he swears in the first paragraph of his petition, that he is bound to collect and pay over to the stockholders of the Institute TWENTY PER CENT. ON ALL THE CAPITAL STOCK OF THE INSTITUTE! which is double the largest amount that can ever be appropriated in that way.

"* * * and as such Treasurer he is in duty bound to collect and receive from the students of said Institute, and other sources, an amount of money equal to twenty per cent. on all the capital stock subscribed to said Institute, and to disburse the same to all holders of said stock, according to their respective shares."

"Sworn to this 10th day of April, 1856, before me,

"THOMAS SPOONER,

"By Deputy, THOS. WINTER."

What does this mean? He could not have expected to impose upon any body or accomplish any purpose by such a flagrant falsehood. The only reasonable explanation of such swearing is, that having his mind zealously bent upon obtaining money from the Faculty to benefit himself he felt disposed to intensify or exaggerate all his claims in that direction, and therefore wrote his claim at twenty per cent. instead of ten, without pausing to reflect whether it was true or false. This instance shows, at least, that even his sworn statements are not to be received without great caution and skepticism.

2d and 3d. The oath of Dr. Newton that official meetings had been held by the Board of Trustees under injunction, and that he had been totally excluded from the College is expressed as follows:

"and that Defendants have disregarded the said order of said Court, by holding meetings as Trustees, and giving orders, and by retaining exclusive possession of the premises described in said petition, as Trustees, as described therein: and Defendants, as such Trustees, have not only assumed to act, but have really acted as Trustees as aforesaid, and excluded plaintiff from all participation in said premises, all which is contrary to law, and in contempt of the said order of this court."

Amendment added during trial, "and on Monday, the 14th of April, actually locked the door and excluded Plaintiff from said Institute."

The first portion of the oath, that the Trustees had HELD MEETINGS AND GIVEN ORDERS, was based upon *no fact*, but was *contrary to the fact*. Having a suspicion that such might be the fact, and a strong desire that it should be, he swore that it was, as he wished it to be. The fact was, that no meeting of the Board had been held at all. Dr. Buchanan, supposing that the meeting would be held according to adjournment, notified him to be present, and in about an hour after, sent him a written notice, that the previous information was a mistake. He received and read these notices, and therefore, knew that he had no evidence of a meeting being held. *How then could he have the audacity to swear to a meeting which was not held, and of which he had no evidence at all?* Just as he has the audacity to publish many statements which are *equally groundless*. It is the apparent improbability that any man of average intelligence will fabricate such baseless falsehoods that gives them currency. It is difficult to believe at first that such depravity and folly should be found in an educated physician; but I believe they never were found associated in any well-educated man.

Dr. Newton's affidavit, that he had been "excluded from all participation" in the College edifice, was based solely upon the fact that the outer door of the College had once been accidentally locked at the commencement of his lecture hour, as I had gone to the College to unlock it, but forgotten to do so. The door was consequently locked until one of the students could find me and obtain the key, which was immediately returned with an apology; and additional time was offered to Dr. N. to compensate his accidental loss, which he refused to accept. Yet, knowing these circumstances, he amended his affidavit in court, by adding a specification of the time and place when he

had been excluded from all participation. According to Dr. Newton's charges, the Trustees and officers of the College had violated the temporary injunction, and were guilty of contempt—and he boasted of the punishment that would be inflicted. But, upon the trial, *his own cross-examination by Judge Probasco*, dissipated and refuted his whole story. He was forced to confess that he knew of no Trustees' meetings, and that the accidental cause of the door being closed had been explained to him; and he was asked how he could swear to such meetings when he had no evidence of their occurrence? This question, to which he could give no satisfactory answer, exposed his falsehood and annihilated his case, which was specially dismissed by the Court, as groundless.

The exercises of the College were repeatedly interrupted by these legal proceedings which were all based upon a *false and groundless charge*. Would the man who brings his falsehoods into court hesitate as to publishing any amount of falsehood in an irresponsible newspaper?

4. To sustain his groundless claim to be considered Treasurer of the Board of Trustees (after he had been removed,) he swore that he had been first elected by the Board of Trustees, and subsequently re-elected every year by the Board. The fact was, however, that the Board never elected him by name, and never re-elected him at all. There is no record of any such re-election, but only of his being once recognized by the Board in consequence of his relation to them *ex-officio*, viz.: that while Treasurer of the Faculty he was *ex-officio* Treasurer of the Board. So far from the Board holding such elections, they were not even possible, as the Board did not hold a single meeting from January 26, 1853, to July 2, 1855. His re-election thus was PURELY FICTITIOUS, like his official meetings and acts of the Board at a time when they neither met nor acted. Does not this show that he swears with great facility to any thing which he wishes and hopes may be true, without waiting to know whether it is or is not?

EXTRACT FROM THE AFFIDAVIT OF DR. NEWTON.

"On the 26th of January, 1853, by a Resolution of the Board of Trustees, he was chosen as Treasurer of the Faculty, Treasurer of the Board of Trustees—which latter office had from the time affiant came into the Institute up to that time been filled by Dr. L. E. Jones. So far as affiant knows and believes, there has never been any election of Treasurer of the Faculty since that time, except the pretended election of Dr. Wm. Sherwood on the 5th of April, 1856. [This was a regular election by the Faculty, to which not a shadow of objection could be adduced.—W. S.] Affiant has continued to act as Treasurer of the Board of Trustees, from said 26th of January, 1853, until the present time, and still holds that office. He was regularly elected Treasurer by each new Board of Trustees, although no record has been kept of such election, nor of the election of any other officer of the Board, except in 1855, and the last election, which was on the 7th of April, 1856.

"Sworn to April 23, 1856, before JOHN A. LYNCH,
"Notary Public."

FROM THE AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN REEVES.

"This affiant being first sworn, says: That he has been a member of the Board of Trustees of the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati, since April 7, 1851, as shown by the records of the Institute, and although not a stockholder, he has felt interested in the prosperity of the said Institute, and has generally, when practicable, attended the meetings of the Board of Trustees, and so far as he knows, no election of officers of said Board was held during the years 1853 and 1854, but that he believes the officers of 1852 held over until 1855, except that W. S. Merrill, was, as he is informed, appointed by consent of some members of the Board, without a meeting, to be secretary after A. S. Chew left the city."

The simple affirmation of such a man as JOHN REEVES would outweigh the testimony of a score of Newtons.

My own affidavit, April 23, 1856, is clear and explicit on this subject:

"Affiant further states that although the plaintiff, R. S. Newton, has, for so long a time, until April 5, 1856, been Treasurer of the Faculty and of the Board of Trustees, he held such offices solely because of his appointment by the Faculty on the 25th day of January, 1853. That the Board of Trustees did not meet to organize in 1853 and 1854, and the action of the Board on July 2, 1855, was a mere recognition of its own rule, that the Treasurer of the Faculty shall be the Treasurer of the Board. This, affiant distinctly remembers, and knows to be true, from the fact, that the said action was taken upon information given by

this affiant of said Newton's being Treasurer of the Faculty."

Moreover, I would add, that the record of the Board of Trustees, produced in court, shows this to be the fact, viz., that Dr. Newton was not elected, but simply recognized as being Treasurer *ex-officio* in 1855. Dr. Newton, therefore, was never either elected or re-elected to this office, as stated in his affidavit. *He wished it had been so, and he swore that it was so.* With the aid of another affidavit-maker as courageous as himself, what could he not have proved?

Although there is, of course, no official record of the period during which meetings were not held, there is a *written record* WHICH HE CAN NOT DENY, and which will yet be produced, if he should persist in his statement.

5. An equally deceptive but more ingenious perversion of truth was made in reference to the financial condition of the Institute. The report of Dr. Newton to the Faculty, presented a very erroneous view of financial matters, especially in suppressing the important fact that he had received \$775 in the form of diploma fees, as collected from the students by himself. In his affidavit in the injunction case, this financial report was embodied and read as a portion of his affidavit, without any correction or explanation on this subject. The counter affidavit of Dr. Buchanan charged him with this *suppression of the diploma fees*. An affidavit was then made by Dr. Newton, in which he again *declined to admit that he had received them*, and by general denial, produced the impression on every mind, that he entirely *denied that statement*. When Judge Storer asked if Dr. Newton admitted receiving these diploma fees, his counsel, Mr. Hoadley, replied that he did not, and that upon that subject there was a *direct conflict of testimony*. This, though more artful, was as flagrant an attempt at deception, as the previous examples. Other instances of falsehood might be quoted from Dr. Newton's testimony, but they relate to matters of a less public nature.

EXAMPLES OF RECKLESS FALSEHOOD.

6. The assertion of Dr. Newton in the Express, that the court had ordered the last stock issued by the Faculty to be brought into court and canceled, is in his usual style of mendacity. The question of cancellation had not been acted upon by the court at all; it is yet under trial. The court, instead of ordering cancellation, gave the plaintiffs leave to *petition for it*—the petition has yet to be acted on. And we are confident, from the best legal advice, that the petition can not be granted.

7. In the same style of recklessness is his assertion in the Express illustrated by cuts, that in consequence of this order of cancellation, the Faculty have left Cincinnati for Texas and other parts of the United States. Not one of the Faculty had changed his residence or place of business, when that falsehood was published.

For additional illustrations of intellectual profligacy, observe the fact that, after having repeatedly denounced Dr. L. E. Jones for his malicious mendacity, having pronounced him to be below the level of humanity—and his pamphlets to be filthy and unworthy of notice—he goes down to the level of Dr. Jones, and allows him to publish extensively, in the Journal and the Express, the same "*filth*" which was once beneath notice of Dr. N., and is still beneath the notice of *all who respect themselves*. Having responded to Dr. Jones' attacks upon Dr. Buchanan, by denying that he had said any thing derogatory to Dr. B., and by certifying that he believed in Dr. Buchanan's system of Anthropology as a true science, he now opens wide his columns, to disseminate Dr. Jones' scurrility against it. Having labored vigorously for the expulsion of Dr. Jones, accusing him of falsehood, and charging him publicly with infamous conduct (before the medical class)—having looked upon him with contempt for three years, which was reciprocated with compound interest—he finds it necessary to obtain Dr. Jones' co-operation, and forthwith puffs him in the Journal, calls him professor, and congratulates the public on his appointment, as an act of justice. In the relations between them in 1852-3, either Dr. Jones was infamous or Dr. Newton was a slanderous knave. If his charges against Dr. Jones, so extensively proclaimed in 1853, were false, his conduct was infamous then; if they were true, as was universally believed, he is infamous now, for associating with such a man, and aiding him in his scurrilous labors. Dr. Jones has retracted nothing he has said of Dr. Newton, for he still considers it all true, and expects to castigate him again as soon as their conspiracy explodes. Dr. Newton has not *specifically* retracted, but has smothered his accusations in compliments, which he can easily retract, and leave Dr. Jones as before,

beneath the level of humanity, in his "filth" and "malacia." It is no tax upon Dr. Newton's conscience to shift his ground or break his pledges from week to week, according to convenience. It brings no blush to his face, for he counts largely, very largely, on human gullibility, and fully believes that, even when convicted of a total disregard of truth and honor, he can sustain himself by clamorous abuse, and by raising fictitious charges against those who may expose his tergiversations. In short, he regards the medical profession as a gullible mass, easily caught, and controlled by the shallow tricks of the demagogue. He firmly believes that a lie well stuck to is as good as the truth, for as fast as one lie wears out it can be replaced by another. When his oath, charging the Faculty and Trustees with violating the injunction of the Superior Court (which he gave out would procure their imprisonment), was proved in court, by *his own cross-examination, to be a falsehood*, it was no matter, another fiction was ready; he could swear to enough to suspend the whole action of the corporation, by injunction, and his half a dozen followers were exulting in the prospect; but the allegations upon which he based his hopes were again proved false in court, and the injunction dismissed or dissolved. No matter, another falsehood will answer the purpose. He forthwith proclaims that the court has ordered the cancellation of the last issue of stock, and this new falsehood will answer for hundreds, who see no contradiction until they hear the result of the trial. And to help the matter along, he proclaims at the same time, that the Faculty, alarmed at the decision of the court, have taken their departure for Texas and various other regions, and he is quite confident that all who see this monstrous fabrication will be convinced that Dr. Newton is triumphant, and that the Faculty have abandoned the Institute, and left Cincinnati in despair. And probably a number, who do not know the infamous character of Newton's Express, are really of the opinion that such is the fact, although it is a *pure fabrication, without the semblance of a fact* upon which to base it. The Faculty have all been at home, engaged in their usual avocations. By circulating large editions of the Express, the impression may thus be made, that the Faculty of the Institute are extinct, and that Newton, Jones & Co. are the only representatives of Eclecticism in Cincinnati. Under that impression he expects to enlist a considerable number in his support, and he feels entirely sure that this *mammoth lie* will answer his purpose until the Faculty announcement has been sent throughout the country; but still hopes that his widely disseminated lie will flourish in some out of the way places, for a year or two, and yield him a harvest of gulls, with all the patronage they can give. If these falsehoods wear out by the first of October, they are only a small part of his stock in trade; he has fifty others sown broad-cast at the same time, the majority of which, on account of their contemptible nature, will never be noticed. In addition to these he has malignant epithets, in which is conveyed a large amount of *concentrated falsehood*. The regular issue of stock by the proper authorities, in accordance with all the forms of law, is called a "forgery" and a "fraud." As fast as these fabrications wear out and become unfit for use, a fresher and livelier batch of falsehoods and coarse epithets will be ready; and he expects, so dull is his own moral sense, that the community generally, will forget his exploded fictions in the interest created by his latest fabrications.

It rests with the intelligence of the public to say whether the man who habitually sows falsehood and slander broadcast, shall reap any thing therefrom but a harvest of infamy.

His last and most scandalous attack upon myself, by mis-stating the treatment of a case of poisoning, so perfectly exhibits the character of the man, and the course which he generally pursues in his controversies, that I will introduce it here, as a specimen of the Newtonian system of calumny.

It is the common policy of unprincipled men to cover up their own misdeeds by raising false charges against others. Hence, Dr. Newton, after his turbulent seizure of the College edifice, with guns, pistols, knives, &c., charged the Faculty with endeavoring to break the peace! which in reality they prevented being done. Having made a false and fraudulent report as Treasurer, and having suppressed the truth in his affidavit, by concealing the fact that he had received \$75 of diploma fees, he charged Dr. Buchanan with disguising the facts, and holding concealed the College funds, when Dr. B. had made a public exhibit in Court. As the Faculty had requested Dr. Buchanan last fall to take charge of the books and not allow Dr. Newton to collect the funds, he now asserts in his Express, that the Faculty have refused to permit Dr. Buchanan to col-

lect the funds of this session, which he knows is false, as Dr. Buchanan declared in Court last spring that he merely took charge of the collections at the request of the Faculty, because of their unwillingness to leave the matter with Dr. Newton—and that, as the office of Treasurer was now suitably occupied, he would leave the collections entirely in the hands of that officer. Dr. Buchanan gave up the business as soon as he could, because he never desired to perform it at all. Dr. Newton gave it up very reluctantly, because the books were taken from him.

On the same principle we must explain Dr. Newton's attack upon my own professional reputation. His own professional blunders and mal-practice probably suggested the idea. He is now under prosecution (damages \$5,000) for mal-practice in a case of fracture of the arm, and Mr. ———, who is now lame from an injury of the thigh, mal-treated by Dr. Newton, is a limping illustration of his surgical ignorance. If it becomes necessary to tell the whole truth, I shall show up his mal-practice and surgical quackery.

The facts as they actually occurred in the poisoning case were as follows:

The patient (æt. 26) under feelings of mental depression, took 3½ grains of strychnine, dissolved in water acidulated with acetic acid, and about half an hour later I found him in convulsions.

I was the first one called to the patient; administered *Tinct. Lob. and Cap. Com.*, as stated in my report, stepped across the street to procure some lard oil, but failed to get it, returned within three or four minutes, called for some sweet oil, and on approaching the patient, found Dr. O. E. Newton offering him a glass of sweet oil. I at once entreated the patient to take it, which he did. At this time Dr. R. S. N. came in and found me officiating, but neither of them spoke to me.

A special friend of the patient took me aside and requested me to do all in my power in connection with the others to save the man. I replied that they did not seem disposed to speak to me, and proposed to retire and leave the case in their hands. He insisted that I should remain, and at his request I spoke to them, proposing to carry out my original design of removing the first draught of oil with the stomach pump. They strenuously objected, but after considerable argument, Dr. R. S. N. consented. I produced my pump, removed the oil from the stomach, and injected a dose of lard oil, which had now been procured at my request. The *Alcoholic Tinct. of Camphor* was introduced into the second dose of oil by Dr. N. himself, while I held and used the pump. About one o'clock he had another spasmodic attack, at which time I gave him a fluid drachm of tinct. camphor with half a pint of strong coffee.

After 1 o'clock, when the second spasmodic attack had passed off, Dr. R. S. N. came in. I told him what had been done; he nodded and left the house. I did not meet either of the Newtons afterward, though I continued to visit the case until I considered all danger past.

The prescription of *Oleo res. Xanthoxylum, etc.*, was made, if at all, by Dr. N. in the absence of any emergency, and without consultation, and I never knew the fact till I saw the statement in print. My own brother-in-law stayed with the patient all night, and no such powders were given while he was there.

In his hot haste for slander, Dr. Newton, before my report had been issued, published the following mis-statements. I had carefully avoided any reference to the Newtons—to their unscientific course in objecting to the use of the stomach pump. I had not mentioned their names for I disliked to engage in such petty contests.

Dr. Newton specified in his report the administration of sweet oil and lard oil by himself and brother—*entirely omitted all reference to the most important measure in the case, the use of the stomach pump*—and made no statement of my own agency in the case, except to say, "we then learned that Dr. Sherwood had been there and had administered alcoholic tinctures and left the patient;" and again, "before I arrived there Dr. Sherwood had volunteered a prescription of camphor water." He adds:

"We leave the profession to form their own opinion of the effect of introducing alcoholic tinctures into an empty stomach (as in this case) containing 3½ grains of Strychnine. It is soluble in this medium; and would it not by this means be diffused more rapidly through the system? I think it was well that he got the oil before it had much time to act on the poison."

R. S. N."

Could there have been a baser falsification than the above?—my own treatment was by oil, *Tinct. Lob. Cap. Comp.*, the stomach pump, and camphor in coffee at the time of the second attack; Dr. Newton's was by oil camphor and xanthoxylum without the stomach pump—

any intelligent physician can perceive which was most rational. He basely suppressed the most important measure in the case, the use of the pump, and charged me with endangering the patient's life by using alcoholic tinctures (*concealing their names in his statement*) to dissolve the strychnine, when he knew that it was taken in solution. Disgusting as the subject is, I shall briefly notice a few more of Dr. Newton's calumnies, by copying from the College Journal for June:

"CONCENTRATED EXTRACTS OF FALSEHOOD.

"With the assistance of the very notorious Dr. L. E. Jones, and his old budget of vituperation, Dr. Newton has succeeded in filling many pages of his journal and newspaper with scurrilous misstatements, many of which he has heretofore treated as wretched slanders. His anxiety now to revive the stale falsehoods upon which he once trampled in disgust, illustrates the desperate nature of his case. We do not propose to give much attention to these matters, but merely concentrate a few of his falsehoods, to show our readers the character of his warfare.

"Falsehood 1st. 'The following resolutions were written by Dr. J. R. Buchanan, and acquiesced in by a minority of the students—that portion of the class who were induced by the five expelled Professors to go with them.' This falsehood is entirely pure—there is no magnesium adulteration here. Dr. Buchanan had no agency whatever, direct or indirect, in the preparation of those resolutions of the class here referred to. *They were the unbiased, uninfluenced sentiments of the class, and were not only adopted, but were actually signed by a large majority of the class.* Their signatures are preserved, and the statements of the gentlemen by whom the resolutions were written could easily be obtained, if necessary. The only suggestion made by Dr. Buchanan was publicly given, viz: to express their sentiments honestly and freely, but to be careful to use prudent and temperate language.

"Falsehood 2d. That the capital stock of the Eclectic Medical Institute is not \$60,000, as enacted by the Legislature. The fact that the amount is sixty thousand dollars being certified on every stock certificate, over the signature of R. S. Newton, who now denies it.

"Falsehood 3d. 'One of the attorneys who stated to them that there was no remedy but a resort to physical force, as there was no legal process by which we who owned a large majority of the stock, could be driven from our own house.' The attorney did suggest that the rioters might be treated properly by physical force, as any other burglars, if we thought proper to do so, which would be more summary than the tedious process of law, but he never for a moment intimated that they could not be removed by the due course of law.

"Falsehood 4th. 'The Court has already pronounced the \$7,000 of stock to be illegal, and has ordered it into the Court to be canceled, which order they seem disposed to resist as long as the rules of the Court will allow them.' A very impudent assertion. This is merely what Dr. N. has petitioned for; WHEN HE GETS such an order as he says the Court has already given, he will feel a great deal more comfortable than he does in his present predicament. The above falsehood is altogether too modest. Why did not Dr. N. say at once that the Court had granted the injunction he prayed for, and suspended the old Board of Trustees and Faculty?

"Falsehood 5th. 'He (Dr. Buchanan) conceals the fact that he collected the tuition fees both of the Winter and Spring sessions,' &c., &c. This fact is not only public in its own nature, but the whole history of the management of the funds was detailed by Dr. Buchanan in his affidavit during the late trial, in which the Faculty were triumphant. The only suppression of facts was the suppression by Dr. Newton himself in his financial report of the Diploma fees (between seven and eight hundred dollars) collected by himself. He was publicly charged in court with this suppression, and could not vindicate himself from the charge.

"Falsehood 6th. Is a miserable slander against Dr. Morrow, representing him as having written a letter abusive of Dr. Buchanan, while his published language and expressions to friends were the very reverse. The letter was long since pronounced a forgery—it bears intrinsic evidence of fraud upon its face, and it has not been nor can it be produced. The evidence is that the *veracious* Dr. Jones says that SOMEBODY ELSE says that that this production is an extract from Dr. Morrow's letter—the letter and its reporter are both invisible. Every expression against Dr. Buchanan, which Dr. Jones reported as having been used by living professors of the Institute, they promptly denied—it is safer to slander the dead than the living.

"Falsehood 7th. The assertion that Dr. Buchanan desired and urged the removal of Dr. Morrow from the Institute. *A pure fiction.* Dr. Morrow and Dr. Hill were the only members of the original faculty whom Dr. B. considered of any importance; and but for their presence he would not have been willing to be a member of the Faculty himself. The relations of these three gentlemen were always intimate, courteous and friendly in every respect.

"Falsehood 8th. The whole story of Dr. Buchanan's *'abusive efforts to drag Dr. Beach before the public.'* The Faculty of the Institute were unanimous when they dropped the name of Dr. Beach, in the sentiment that it was necessary to disconnect the Institute from Dr. Beach's unfortunate reputation; and so have the Faculty been from that time to the present, including the very individuals Drs. Newton and Jones, who now identify themselves with a reputation of which they were ashamed as long as they held a respectable position in the Institute. They are welcome to the association. Instead of dragging Dr. Beach before the public, the Faculty decided that they would drop his name without passing any resolutions on the subject, as quietly as possible, to avoid attracting notice to the fact that Dr. Beach had received an honorary emeritus title from the Institute.

"Falsehood 9th. 'Taking the whole spring class, a large majority were decidedly opposed to the conduct of the expelled members throughout the whole session.' The class, in publishing their resolutions, stated that they were adopted by forty out of about fifty then in the city. We presume they counted carefully, and we can exhibit the signatures of nearly that number in addition to others who voted for the resolutions but did not attach their signatures.

"Falsehood 10th. 'Buchanan & Co. did everything in their power to deter students from expressing their opinion by intimating that if they expected to graduate, they had better look out,' &c. Equally false and silly—every one knows that if he wanted a diploma from Dr. Newton he could very easily get it."

Among the latest slanders of Dr. Newton is the following avowal of his desperate purposes, which deserves to be placed on record. It is self-evident to any true gentleman that the author of such an article is unfit for the honorable position of a medical professor. He admits and boasts that in order to maintain an imagined right, which had not been established by law, he deliberately prepared to sacrifice the lives of the members of the medical class, if they should dare to assert the right to sit in their Hall, to which they were entitled and for which they had paid. The remainder of his statement is in his usual style of falsehood; the members of the medical class who applauded in their resolutions the *peaceful course* of the Faculty, would refute his statement if appealed to. Dr. Buchanan simply advised the students to demand, peaceably, admission to their lecture room, in order to establish beyond all doubt that they were excluded by armed force, and to fasten the charge upon the guilty parties. He accompanied them in doing so, and stood upon the stairway face to face with the rioters, demanding admission, until this matter was clearly established. He then urged them to ferberance, and took pains to prevent any possible collision from the indignation produced by the insulting deportment of the rioters. No disrespect was shown to Dr. B. by the rioters, nor was any pistol pointed at him or exhibited to him. Their insolence was displayed against members of the class. The circumstances stated by Dr. N. are *purely fictitious*.

"Dr. Buchanan then made a speech, urging forward the few deluded students who went with him and his party [Dr. N. carefully conceals the fact that upwards of three-fourths or about four-fifths of the class were united with the Faculty; they felt a vivid indignation against his riotous course, and rejoiced in his expulsion.—W. S.] to forcibly enter the college; and that too when he knew it could be done only over the dead bodies of its defenders—which we had the good fortune to hear in part. After he had got the few students worked up to the fighting point, as he thought, he secured his spectacles more firmly on his nose, and thus appealed to or commanded them: 'Go on.' The students moved forward as though they intended to force their way up stairs; at which instant we could not help smiling (even though the danger was imminent, and we well knew that every one of the mob would have been shot down by the guard, had they pushed the attempt) to see Dr. Buchanan, as soon as he had given the order, 'Go up, boys,' dodge his head behind the door, whenever a Col's six shooter came in contact with his

visual organs. While the Doctor was in this heroic posture, he reminded us very much of an ostrich which thinks but little of the body, if the head be hidden. We said to this mob then, as we do now, in the language of the Yankee officer, when commanded to surrender, 'Come and take us!'

Why does Dr. Newton thus coarsely assail Dr. Buchanan? There never was any personal difference between them. It is simply because Dr. Buchanan felt compelled, by a sense of duty, to condemn the course of Dr. N.—because, after Dr. Buchanan had announced to the Faculty his intended resignation at the close of the spring session, he found Dr. Newton conspiring to overthrow his colleagues, and determined that he would sacrifice his own objects rather than leave his colleagues in the midst of their difficulties, brought on by pursuing an upright professional course; hence, Dr. N.'s continual intimations, that there was something wrong in the financial matters of the College, when he knows that Dr. B. is both able and willing to meet all his liabilities, and that the course which he has pursued was sustained by his colleagues. Although generally considered irresponsible himself, he charged Drs. Buchanan and Sherwood with insolvency; this charge was refuted in open court, and was pronounced untrue by Judge Storer. It will appear upon the settlement of accounts that *Dr. Newton is himself a debtor to the Faculty, for money for which he has never accounted*, and that every dollar which Dr. Buchanan has collected was collected legally and fully accounted for.

The following notice of one of Dr. Newton's charges, in the College Journal of September, will terminate this selection of choice specimens of malignant slander.

"IMPUDENT.—Dr. Newton, whose *whole literary career is nothing but a plagiarism*—whose lectures, editorials and essays are all bought, borrowed, or stolen goods (having never in his life written ten consecutive pages of scientific matter himself), charges Prof. Cleveland with plagiarism!! and has the *folly* to publish at the same time matter upon which the charge is based: viz., an essay by Dr. Collins and a contribution of Dr. Cleveland to King's Obstetrics. The articles resemble each other simply because they advocate similar doctrines, and are no more alike than any other scientific essays from different authors, embodying similar views. The same doctrines were originally presented by English authors, from whom Prof. Cleveland long since derived them in the first instance. But Dr. Newton, in his profound ignorance of the literature of the profession,

supposed they had never been presented to the world until Dr. Collins advanced them. The ideas may have been entirely original with Dr. Collins, but Dr. Cleveland did not obtain them from him, and did not present them as original with himself. If Dr. Newton wishes to know with what contempt Dr. Collins regards such trickery, he will not find it difficult to ascertain.

"The vindictive enmity of Dr. Newton against Dr. Cleveland, appears to have completely stultified him, otherwise he would not have had the consummate folly to publish a charge, and publish the refutation with it. It is indeed honorable to Dr. C., that his industrious enemy who has been looking out in a secret and unbecoming manner for some materials for a personal attack, should have been able to trump up nothing but this *barefaced absurdity*. We expect him, when he perceives that he is defeated, to trump up other charges equally malicious and false, for he has been thus engaged ever since he discovered that Prof. C. would not serve as a literary tool, and co-operate in upholding adulterated medicines. We would commend to his attention the remark of a philosophic moralist:

"If a man wishes to put himself down effectually and thoroughly, for this world and the next, let him persist in endeavoring to put down some one else. The experiment has never failed, and never will."

"The truth of this doctrine has been exemplified by Dr. L. E. Jones, and is now being exemplified by Dr. R. S. Newton."

An irresistible feeling of contempt and disgust prevents me from following up any further the numerous little falsifications and misrepresentations of Dr. N. and Dr. J., in College matters. To honorable men, it is sufficient to show, that a witness has been repeatedly guilty of inexcusable and unquestionable falsehood, knowingly, maliciously or recklessly; and when that has been established his whole story is discredited.

A controversy with such men as Newton and Jones, who have no regard for truth, nor sense of strict honor, is endless in its nature, and becomes lower and lower as it is prolonged; but an exposition of their true character appeared to be necessary to arrest their impositions upon credulity. The task is performed, and I leave them to propagate their "malaria," with the conviction that intelligent and honorable men will not be greatly influenced by the superabundant falsehoods and scurrilities of medical demagogues.

VERACITY OF DR. L. E. JONES.

To most of the old students and friends of the Institute little need be said upon this subject, for Dr. Jones' character is too well known. I write for the benefit of those who have not seen the facts which I have to adduce.

After Dr. L. E. Jones had, by a course of turbulence, malice, and ungentlemanly conduct, compelled the Faculty to procure his legal expulsion by the Board, his unbounded rage and malice had no other channel in which to vent itself than a warfare of words. He accordingly devoted his time for the rest of the session to lecturing daily over a coffee-house on Western Row, to all whom he could induce to hear him, repeating over and over his tirades against the Faculty, without making any serious impression upon intelligent students.

He also issued three pamphlets, containing malicious falsehoods of so infamous a character, that they were universally condemned, and deprived him of all the little sympathy he had left.

Of these pamphlets, Dr. W. B. Powell remarked, (see proceedings of the Eclectic Physicians of Cincinnati and Covington,) that Dr. Jones, unfortunately, "yielded to the suggestions of his animal man, and has fallen below the possibility of redemption." Whether Dr. Jones can be redeemed by associating with one who has fallen equally low in veracity and honor, or whether they will hold each other down with leaden weight, I leave to the reader.

Many of the falsehoods of Dr. Jones were in relation to the lectures and proceedings of the Faculty, which were well known to the medical class, and so disgusted were the gentlemen of the class—the very same to whom Dr. J. had lectured, who had heard his tirades, and who were

fully acquainted with both sides of the question, that Dr. J. had scarcely a friend left in the class to shield him from condemnation as an *infamous slanderer*. The following resolutions were adopted by the class February 18, 1853, near the close of the session, and as stated by the report of the Committee of Eclectic Physicians, "one hundred and twenty-eight were counted in the hall of the Institute, of whom but two were opposed to adopting the resolutions. I omit the proceedings of the previous meeting, and six of the resolutions for the sake of brevity.

"WHEREAS, We have carefully read a pamphlet against the Eclectic Medical Institute, recently put forth by Dr. L. E. Jones, signed by A. H. Baldrige, M. D., President, and S. Kyle, M. D., Secretary, purporting to represent the sentiments of the Eclectic Physicians of Cincinnati and vicinity; and, whereas, we know of but one Eclectic physician entertaining such sentiments, excepting the two whose names are signed to the pamphlet:

"1st. *Resolved*, That we regard this pamphlet as an imposition on the public, whom it addresses under the false pretence of expressing the sentiments of the Eclectic physicians of Cincinnati and vicinity, when in reality it only expresses the ideas and language of Dr. L. E. Jones, which are prompted solely by the desire to inflict injury upon the most successful, talented, and efficient school of medical reform now in existence.

"2nd. *Resolved*, That the entire pamphlet is filled with a series of slanderous misrepresentations, which render it entirely unworthy of public confidence, and prove that its author has but little regard to the claims of truth and honor.

"3d. *Resolved*, That the assertion that the class generally sympathize with L. E. Jones, and approve his course, is a slander upon the class.

"4th. *Resolved*, That the assertion that seventy or eighty students left the Institute on account of the expulsion of Dr. L. E. Jones, and the 'inefficient teachings of the Faculty,' is grossly false, as it is well known to the entire class that the number of students in attendance upon the lectures immediately after the expulsion of Dr. Jones, instead of being diminished was actually greater than it was immediately previous to that act.

"6th. *Resolved*, That the imputations of chicanery and fraud against the present Faculty are utterly groundless, and are disgraceful only to the slanderer who utters the ridiculous charge.

"7th. *Resolved*, That the expulsion of Dr. L. E. Jones was an act of necessity, for the preservation of the Institute, and that the assertion that he was expelled on account of his opposition to Homoeopathy, is a falsehood so totally groundless as to prove its author capable of fabricating falsehoods without a scruple.

"8th. *Resolved*, That when the announcement was made that Dr. L. E. Jones had been expelled from the Institution—that the class received the announcement with 'sadness and silence,' 'with surprise and mortification,' by the members of the class in general, is very far from truth; the truth being, that the announcement was received and applauded with unusual interest, as the class knew that he could not longer remain in his chair and harmony prevail in the Institution.

"12th. *Resolved*, That we can not too strongly disapprove of the thrusts made at Prof. Buchanan, which deserve the prompt condemnation of all favorable to the cause of Eclecticism, as he has done more than any other individual, except the lamented Prof. Morrow, to forward the cause, and as much depends on him as the able and devoted supporter of Eclecticism, such slanderous attacks can not too promptly meet the disapprobation of all true Eclectics.

"14th. *Resolved*, That the assertion of Dr. L. E. Jones, that he was expelled because he opposed the doctrines of Hahnemann, is utterly false and groundless, as the subject of Homoeopathy, so far as we know, was never a matter of discussion or difference between the members of the Faculty, and he was never, as far as we know, censured or opposed by any one for the views which he expressed on the subject. In all the charges against him we have never heard the subject of Homoeopathy even alluded to, although we have heard many other charges against him of a very serious character.

"16th. *Resolved*, That the assertion that the teachings of Prof. Buchanan are ethereal, wild, incoherent, and visionary fancies, and that they are calculated to subject the graduates and students to 'unmerited reproaches and contumely,' we feel it our duty to deny, as we have heard from the chair which he occupies nothing but a clear and simple explanation of the physiological and pathological subjects which belong to his department presented in a peculiarly original manner, and embracing much important and practical matter, not obtainable from any work with which we are acquainted, or taught in any other medical school of which we have any knowledge.

"17th. *Resolved*, That those who have become acquainted with his wonderful accessions to science do universally accept his teachings as supplying a great vacuum in science, that they are in perfect accordance, as we most firmly believe, with the great laws controlling the animal organism, and that his discoveries in physiological science have rendered parts of the science, heretofore obscure and mystified, clear and plain as any fact in science.

"BARTON PICKERING, "THOS. R. WARD, "W. S. SEVERANCE, "T. C. ELLIS, "GEORGE KELLER,	}	Committee."
--	---	-------------

Dr. Jones attempted to weaken the force of this terrible condemnation, by asserting that the resolutions were written by Dr. Buchanan. This was but another falsehood, as was shown by Dr. Buchanan in his reply, and at the close of the spring session, another batch of Dr. Jones' falsehoods, which had just been issued, was answered spontaneously by the members of the class, in still more pungent resolutions, which were unanimously adopted, so entirely free from the influence of Dr. Buchanan, that he did not even know what the action of the class had been, "until a week after the class had dispersed." The class, on this occasion, unanimously pronounced Dr. Jones'

statements "as vindictive as false, and infamous as untrue." They met and contradicted his various calumnies in detail. They indorsed Dr. King's lectures and declared that they regarded "him as one of the best practitioners of the age," and spoke of Dr. Buchanan as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the assertions that Dr. Buchanan is a 'poor teacher, capable of selecting and impressing but little of any importance—that he is hard to understand, wild and visionary,' are grossly unjust, reflecting dishonor on one of the best physiologists of the age, and if regarded would be detrimental to the progress of physiological science; and that, though his indefatigable labors and lofty deductions may not be appreciated by hunkers, nor understood by the stupid, we highly appreciate them, and regard his lectures as all that could be asked by the students of physiology."

The mendacity of Dr. L. E. Jones, thus branded on his forehead by those who knew him best—who had heard all that he could say in his own behalf, became a generally conceded fact. The committee of Eclectic Physicians, of whom W. Byrd Powell was chairman, remarked in their report (1853), that "Dr. Jones has not himself at this time, sufficient character for veracity to assail the veracity of others."

If Dr. L. E. Jones could have been supposed to have any character worth demolishing after such universal condemnation—after he had been condemned and degraded, first by the very gentlemen for whom he had voted as Professors, who unanimously requested him to resign—next by the gentlemen for whom he had voted as Trustees, in short by those whom he preferred to all others—and after the very students who had sat under his lectures rose and denounced him as a slanderer, an utterer of "infamous" falsehoods—it is certain that it was entirely annihilated in the exposition of his course given by Prof. Buchanan. To those who are fond of seeing justice administered, I would recommend a perusal of Dr. Buchanan's address to the public, appended to the report of the proceedings of Eclectic Physicians, in which the totally false and malicious character of Dr. Jones' publication is fully exposed. That pamphlet was Dr. Jones' deathblow—he sunk into general contempt—so degraded was he, that when reeking with infamy and burning with malice, he prepared another foul mass of calumny—a pamphlet of 40 pages fine print, of which he circulated a large edition in every direction—the gentleman assailed would not even condescend to make any reply. The author was beneath the level of a controversy. Dr. Newton alone noticed the production, which he did in the following language on the cover of the Eclectic Journal, the peculiar elegance and grammatical correctness of which would mark it as the unadulterated production of Dr. Newton, solitary, alone and unassisted, even without his initial "N."

"PAMPHLET EXTRAORDINARY.

"The would-be persecuting enemies of the Eclectic Medical Institute in this city, have issued another edition of their filthy pamphlets, and it exceeds all the specimens of vulgarity, falsehood, bigotry, and premeditated maliciousness which we have ever seen, and could only be equalled by its authors; and none but those who, having sunk so far below every thing that gives to man an elevation beyond the brute creation, would ever think of reviewing or answering so much filth and intended 'malaria.'"

If Dr. Newton had to sink to the level of the brute creation before he could review Dr. Jones' "filth" and "falsehood," it has not required many years for him to accomplish that descent. In less than three years, he is found, cheek by jowl, with Dr. L. E. Jones, retailing by word of mouth, a portion of Jones' calumnies, and publishing choice portions of the "filth" in his Express and Eclectic Journal. Yet, such an association is entirely natural—the man who has been expelled from honorable associations for charlatanism, intrigue and falsehood, has not many downward steps to take to reach the level of Dr. L. E. Jones, nor could two better associates be found for the work of scurrilous calumny. Never has the history of the medical profession in America been disgraced by such a warfare of scurrility as Jones, Newton & Baldrige have carried on against the Faculty of the Institute.

What can such men as Drs. Newton, Jones and Baldrige, all notorious for mendacity, effect by their present combination, after living for years in mutual disgust—each having pronounced the other unfit for any honorable medical position—the testimony of each refuted by the

other? Any impartial spectator can answer, and perhaps a sufficient answer is furnished by the language of Dr. Newton's especial friend, Dr. W. Byrd Powell, in 1853, at the meeting of Eclectic physicians (as written out by himself).

"We now find that ex-professors Jones and Baldridge were at the head of this secretly gotten up convention of *Eclectic*? Physicians, and under all the circumstances connected with this subject can any one imagine it to be possible that opposition to the Institute, inculcated, hatched and promoted by these gentlemen, can effect any thing more than a *public contempt for themselves*? Gentlemen, I have more confidence in the wisdom of the public mind, than to believe it." The result verified the prediction. Jones and Baldridge became objects of public contempt, and no one had a profounder contempt for them than Dr. B. S. Newton.

Misery makes strange companions—but it is very natural that men who have sunk to a common level, and who are outlived beyond the pale of professional respectability, should cling together for mutual defense. Yet, if a hundred such should be found and brought into a common league, by their common dishonor, their loud asseverations and mutual indorsements would not constitute

truth, nor give any plausibility or respectability to their pretensions. Such, however, is the weakness of human nature, that any combination of individuals, embracing a considerable number, no matter how far depraved or dishonored, will exert considerable influence in misleading ignorant or inexperienced individuals, and corrupting those whose moral principles have not acquired maturity and firmness. The mere toleration and polite recognition of such a nucleus of corruption is sufficient to propagate its baleful influence among the rising young men of the profession.

"Vice is a monster of that hideous mien,
Which to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

There is no method of saving the ranks of reformatory medicine from the corrupting influence which is now organized, but by a stern refusal to tolerate or countenance in any manner, that which is thoroughly corrupt. Withhold all patronage or professional sympathy from such fungus organizations, from their publications and lectures, and their morbid growth perishes by ligation, leaving the profession healthy and pure.

END OF THE IMPOSITION—THE INJUNCTION.

After the riotous usurpation of the College building a proposition was immediately made by the mobocrats to submit to a legal arbitration the question between themselves and the authorities of the Institute. This was addressed to us by advertisement in the newspapers, while for form's sake, a copy was also privately sent us. A reply to this banter was at once prepared; but, upon reflection, it was deemed useless to engage in a warfare of newspaper advertisements with parties so undignified and unprincipled.

The reply was not sent—the matter was simply referred to our counsel, with instructions to procure an arbitration as early as possible. Dr. Newton continued to publish his proposition, falsely boasting that he was as eager to settle as the Faculty were to protract the controversy. Our counsel having no faith in the sincerity of the proposition, and being very much occupied in their business, allowed a few weeks to pass before taking measures to secure the arbitration. This delay was considered expedient, as our opponents were thus allowed to continue the proffer and boast of their readiness to engage in arbitration, so as to be fully committed to the proposition, from which they could not withdraw, without additional dishonor. When they were approached by our counsel to make an appointment for arbitration, their attorneys professed entire willingness to carry out the proposition in good faith, and we had some confidence that it could be done, in consequence of their assurance. The matter was, however, repeatedly postponed, on the plea that one of the attorneys was called away from the city by his engagements. And no appointment could be obtained until Saturday, the 20th of September.

During all this time Dr. Newton maintained his falsehood

before the public without correction—that the Faculty had refused to submit the matter to arbitration, and were relying upon legal delays for their protection.

On the 20th of September, the same attorney who made the appointment to meet on that day and select three arbitrators, failed in his appointment—although in his office within a square of the place, at the time of the appointment—he violated the engagement, and, as we were told, left the city without any explanation. The other parties (the Newtons and their attorneys) who were present, refused to act, but promised to give their answer in a few days. On the 22d of September, they finally refused all arbitration, by a message to Judge Probasco; thus, proving their whole maneuver nothing but a cunning trick, to impose upon the public by a false pretence of confidence in their own cause, and prevent any summary measures from being taken by the Faculty.

The Faculty, therefore, made arrangements for lecture rooms in College Hall (Walnut street) and applied to the Court of Common Pleas for an injunction to arrest the mobocrats in the use of the building, and in their false assumptions as Trustees and Faculty. The injunction was granted, and the whole imposition and spurious organization are now LEGALLY ANNIHILATED, until they can show some justice in their claims, which they have not done, and can not do.

They are prohibited from using the College edifice and College property, from granting diplomas, matriculating students, or performing any other act, whatever, as Trustees or Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute. Thus ends the imposition. FALSEHOOD AND VIOLENCE ARE PROSTRATE BENEATH THE LAW; the old organization of the Eclectic Medical Institute stands as firm as ever and without a rival.

October 11th, 1856.

PUBLICATIONS

BY THE FACULTY OF THE INSTITUTE.

THE
College Journal

OF

MEDICAL SCIENCE,

Is a monthly journal of forty pages, established under the following resolution, adopted at a regular meeting of the Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute, November 26, 1855:

"Resolved, That in order to aid in the advancement of Liberal Medicine, the Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati deem it expedient that a monthly periodical be established, subject to the Editorial control of a majority of its members."

TERMS:—ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM,
IN ADVANCE.

The JOURNAL has been put at the lowest possible figure, and advance payment is the invariable rule. Paying subscribers are, therefore, exempt from the tax usually levied upon them to offset "bad debts."

Persons to whom specimen copies of the College Journal are sent need not return them, as no one will be held as a subscriber for the Journal without an express order from him.

Communications for and letters on business connected with the Journal, should be addressed to

WM. SHERWOOD, M. D., *Publisher*,
No. 243 Court St. Cincinnati, O.

THE AMERICAN

Eclectic Practice of Medicine;

By Prof. I. G. JONES & Prof. T. V. MORROW.

In two volumes.—Price \$7. The first edition has been exhausted. A new edition will soon be published.

THE

American Eclectic Dispensatory;

By JOHN KING, M. D.

One volume, royal 8vo., 1,395 pages.—Price, \$6. Third edition within a year.

American Eclectic Obstetrics;

By JOHN KING, M. D.,

Author of the Eclectic Dispensatory.—One volume, Octavo, with seventy illustrations.—Price, \$4.

"We have carefully examined Dr. King's work, and can honestly recommend it as a safe and judicious guide, both to the student and to the practitioner of midwifery.—*Boston Medical and Surgical Journal*.

"His work on Obstetrics is elaborate and thorough in all its details, and will be found of great service in this department of medical science.—*Worcester Journal of Medicine*.

Buchanan's System of Anthropology;

By J. R. BUCHANAN, M. D.

One volume, 8vo., with numerous illustrations. Price, \$2 by mail, prepaid. Address the author, Cincinnati.

BUCHANAN'S SYSTEM OF ANTHROPOLOGY will be forwarded, free of postage, upon the remittance of \$2 as the Author's risk. *Opinions of the Press*:—"It is certainly indicative of ability and industry, no less than sincerity, on the part of the author."—(*North American Review*.) "Beyond all doubt it is a most extraordinary work, exhibiting the workings of a mind of no common stamp."—(*Gospel Herald*.) "It supplies the deficiencies in the phrenological system of Gall and Spurzheim."—(*Louisville Journal*.)

Buchanan's Journal of Man

Is published bi-monthly (64 pages), at \$2 per volume, of 12 numbers. Remit at the Editor's Risk. *Language of the Press*:—"A pioneer in the progress of science."—(*Louisville Democrat*.) "One of the ablest publications in America."—(*Brandon Post*.) "It possesses more originality than any other work with which we are acquainted."—(*Wellsville Herald*.)

Address,

"DR. J. R. BUCHANAN."

ECLECTIC MEDICAL INSTITUTE

The FALL AND WINTER Session of 1856-7, will commence on

MONDAY, THE 20TH OF OCTOBER,

preceded by a preliminary gratuitous course, from the 1st to the 20th, which will present much interesting and important matter to the student.

The Faculty of the Institute will be as follows:

I. G. JONES, M. D.,

Emeritus Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine

A. J. HOWE, M. D.,

Professor of General, Special, and Pathological Anatomy.

J. R. BUCHANAN, M. D.,

Professor of Physiology, and Institutes of Medicine.

C. H. CLEVELAND, M. D.,

Professor of Materia Medica, Therapeutics, and Medical Botany.

WM. SHERWOOD, M. D.,

Professor of Medical Practice and Pathology, and Lecturer on Clinical Medicine.

WALTER BURNHAM, M. D.,

Professor of Surgical Practice, and Operative Surgery.

JOHN KING, M. D.,

Professor of Obstetrics, and the Diseases of Women and Children.

J. W. HOYT, M. D.,

Professor of Chemistry, Pharmacy, and Medical Jurisprudence.

As the Faculty will not be embarrassed by inefficient and factious members, and as the class will have access to the Commercial Hospital, in addition to whatever Clinical Instruction can be introduced from private practice, the next course of Lectures may be looked to as more scientific, thorough, and satisfactory, than any which has ever been given in the Institute. The reputation of Professor Burnham, as a Medical Professor, is well known in the East. As an operative surgeon he is one of the foremost of the profession. Professor Howe has been recommended to the Board as one of the best lecturers on Anatomy in the United States.

The terms for the next session will be the same as for the last, viz: Matriculation, \$5.00. Tuition, \$20.00. Demonstrator's Ticket, \$5.00. Every student is required to engage in dissection one session before graduation. Graduation, \$25.00. Ticket to Commercial Hospital (optional), \$5.00. J. R. BUCHANAN, M. D., Dean of the Faculty.

Cont.

[1856]

THE ONLY TRUE
AND
ACCURATE ANNOUNCEMENT
BY THEMSELVES.

Of the character and abilities of the SPURIOUS FACULTY, who now pretend to represent the Eclectic Medical Institute. Compiled from the manuscripts and publications of said Faculty, with a running commentary.

THE following publication needs no apology. It is customary in Collegiate announcements to speak of the facilities of the Institution announced, and latterly it has become the fashion to state pretty freely the qualifications of the Faculty as they are known or believed by the parties most familiar therewith. This is believed to be a good custom, if honestly observed by true hearted men. The men who unite together must know each other, and they must know each other favorably, by personal knowledge or by report, or they could not unite; consequently, when they express their opinions candidly, they express the truth *with the most favorable construction*, of which the said truth may be susceptible; and, at the same time, they are bound by politeness not to reveal each other's faults. Hence it may be said that a college announcement corresponds to the old maxim, "*put the best foot foremost.*" Nevertheless, it ought to be a true and honest document as far as it goes.

Since the establishment of a new school by Drs. L. E. JONES, NEWTON, BALDRIDGE, & Co., it is to be regretted that their bashfulness has prevented their speaking right out, and explaining each other's qualifications, to the best of their ability; for they know each other so well, that no one could do better justice to their own endowments. Moreover, these parties have, within three years past, described each other so fully, so minutely, and with such *entire and commendable frankness*, that no one can fairly doubt the *honesty of their opinions* publicly expressed, or hesitate to believe that they possess the various distinguishing characteristics which each has discovered in the other, after a long and intimate acquaintance in professional intercourse.

It is proposed, therefore, to assist these bashful gentlemen in circulating their *honest opinions of each other*, which have recently become *unaccountably scarce* in the market. It is to be hoped they have not entirely consigned to the flames those memorials of their recent friendship, of which such large editions were printed. Some of the choice passages are perfect gems in their way, and although the poet has said,

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene,
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear,"

Some individuals are not willing these gems should be entirely lost to mankind.

To preserve due respect for seniority, I shall first allow Dr. Jones to describe somewhat at length the character of the younger individuals whom he has chosen for comrades, on account of a peculiar congeniality of character in pursuit of a common object.

What does Dr. Jones think of Dr. Newton after an acquaintance of several years standing? From a careful perusal of his various writings, it appears that he considers Dr. Newton a mere *pretender* to science, not acquainted with the principles of Eclectic Medicine, which he professes to teach, and not yet purged of the errors of the old school practice in which he was so recently engaged. He considers him a *humbug* in pretending to be an author of books which everybody knows he did not write, and a mere *burlesquer* of Eclectic practice which he does not understand, [although he has learned something of it from Dr. King]. [The reader will pardon the abruptness and severity with which Dr. L. E. Jones demolishes his quondam friend. This is but a concentrated statement of his views, which are quite familiar to the few who have had the opportunity of hearing his benevolent and refined language for the last three years.]

Although Dr. L. E. Jones considered Dr. Newton not yet free from the old school errors in which he was educated, he regarded him as capable, at the same time, of mixing up with old school errors a few of the errors of Samuel Thomson, making altogether a "sickly course" of medical lectures, and a "*burlesque*" on medical reform.

Moreover, he regards him as a *consummate intriguer*—a man who is all things to all men, and who, fearing Eclecticism would not pay, announced himself and colleagues as regular orthodox old school men (at Memphis); but finding that wouldn't work smoothly, tossed another somerset in the dark and came out a full fledged Eclectic. It was not Dr. Newton only who engaged in this double somersetting between Memphis and Cincinnati, according to Dr. Jones, for his associates, Sanders, Freeman, and Powell, were all concerned in it alike—the announcement that they were regular, orthodox, Allopathic—having been written and published by Sanders, [according to Dr. L. E. Jones] under the orders of Newton in their "Bulletin." [That such an announcement was published extensively is well known to the public—it is Dr. L. E. Jones who explains that it was regularly determined on by Newton & Co.]

In addition to all this, Dr. J. considers him not only an intriguer, but a "*scoundrel*," on account of his taking sides clandestinely with the Martha Washington prisoners, and publishing a villainous attack on that noble man, Sidney C. Burton, to instigate his assassination while he was attending the trial of the prisoners. Dr. L. E. Jones fortifies himself on this point by the general testimony of the press, which, at that time, denounced Dr. Newton

as an unprincipled man, for circulating secretly these assassin-like attacks. Dr. Bickley agreed with Dr. Jones at that time on this subject, for he considered Dr. Newton's conduct so disgraceful that he wished him expelled immediately, and actually wrote his own resignation to get out of Dr. Newton's company.

To illustrate these opinions by quotations would require a great deal of space. But I must spare room enough to enable Dr. L. E. Jones to express himself in his own *elegant and ornate* language. In his third pamphlet, page 11, he says:

"King and Newton's names appear as the authors of the Eclectic Dispensatory. It is well known that the entire credit belongs to Dr. King, yet Dr. Newton receives the principal share. So in reference to '*Newton and Powell's Practice*,' very nearly the entire labor devolved upon one man, yet the other receives the credit."

In this Dr. Jones says correctly that Dr. Newton furnished no intellectual capital for that book, but he omits to state the fact that the portions of the book which Dr. Newton pretended were furnished by himself, were written by Dr. King—not that Dr. King was their author in a *scientific* sense, for he would not write such matters in his own name—he merely performed the literary labor of converting Dr. Newton's *crude notions* into readable matter. If Dr. Newton had attempted to write without assistance, it would have been a confused jumble, without even grammatical correctness. So long as Dr. Newton has literary men about him, he will not be apt to expose his intellectual nakedness on paper. When Dr. Newton first published the Eclectic Journal, he wished to appear as editor by writing a little now and then, but his articles were so crude and puerile, that Dr. Buchanan always prepared each article for the press, unless it was a mere dun or short notice. In many cases the whole article was written by Dr. Buchanan, and adopted by Dr. Newton, for the former was not willing to have the Journal disfigured by Dr. Newton's *bona fide* writing, and Dr. Newton himself confessing his "*ignorance and inexperience in writing*," requested Dr. Buchanan to manage the whole matter. When Dr. Newton was attacked by Dr. Latta, his defence was written by Dr. Buchanan. Any one, by looking over back volumes of the Journal, can pick out clumsily written articles of Dr. Newton, which, with all the correction that could be given, still revealed their illiterate paternity. Not a single article was published by Drs. R. S. and O. E. Newton, which has any pretensions to respectability, which was not written by some one else. A full catalogue of the articles which they have borrowed thus from Dr. King, Dr. Buchanan, Dr. Powell, J. M. Sanders, and several others—would strip them *entirely naked* of all pretensions to literary capacity.

On page 17 of his 40 page pamphlet, Dr. L. E. Jones expresses himself very freely: he maintains that it is a "*base slander*," to call Dr. R. S. Newton the equal of Dr. I. G. Jones, (which is very true, but I have never known of any one who considered him a man of the same grade,) or to call Dr. G. W. L. Bickley the equal of Dr. L. E. Jones. (This may be so, but which is slandered by the comparison I would not here undertake to decide, not liking to interfere in family quarrels.) He affirms, also, that it is a very short time since Dr. Newton *pretending to be an Eclectic, was prescribing calomel*; that he was "*Pro-slavery and Allopathic in Arkansas and Memphis—Abolitionist in Ohio, and Eclectic in Cincinnati*," but so incorrect, meagre and confused in his notions of practice that his treatment is "*a mere burlesque*."

The following is the language of Dr. L. E. Jones,

condemning Dr. Newton and Bickley as unworthy successors of Drs. I. G. Jones and himself.

L. E. JONES ON NEWTON AND BICKLEY.

"Those individuals who gave 'entire vitality to the school,' or gave 'shape to its practical teachings, viz: I. G. Jones and L. E. Jones, are not there; and to assert that their substitutes are their equals on these departments, can be viewed, as I believe, only as a base slander. I again repeat that I knew not at that time that Prof. Newton had so recently prescribed calomel, nor did I then know that he had authorized the publication of the article in the Memphis Bulletin (*his paper*), asserting that *his College was a 'Regular Orthodox School'*. Since then I have received the most satisfactory proof that such was the case, his assertions and others to the contrary notwithstanding. It is in perfect accordance with the feelings and acts of some, to be pro-slavery and Allopathic in Arkansas and Memphis—Abolitionist in Ohio, and Eclectic in Cincinnati. Prof. Hulce informed Prof. Baldrick that he acted according to a preconcerted agreement of the Faculty, and of course was authorized to declare publicly that the Memphis Institute was '*orthodox*' or Allopathic. I know of no good reason for disbelieving the disinterested testimony of Prof. Hulce, and accepting that of his interested opponents; and is it not self-evident, if he had, unauthorized, published what purported to be their (his colleague's) sentiments, *wifful falsehood of such moment*, placing them in a position they did not occupy—declaring their school Allopathic, and not Eclectic, that they would have lost no time in correcting an impression, if so erroneous and false as they now assert it was, through the same channel? This I believe was never done in a 'Southern Edition'—self-interest required it in a 'Northern Edition,' and it appeared, though contradictory and very unsatisfactory.

Again, his treatment of our student, Dr. Harris, who died of Pneumonia, as reported by experienced Eclectics who witnessed it, was any thing but Eclectic. To illustrate my position, I will give his treatment in two or three diseases, as published in his late work on the Practice of Medicine:

ACUTE NEPHRITIS.

Treatment.—"During the whole course of the disease, the surface of the body must be bathed frequently with an alkaline wash, and the Compound Tincture of Virginia Snake-root should be given to allay pain, soothe nervous irritability, and keep up a tendency to the surface. The patient should be kept quiet and free from excitement."

CHRONIC NEPHRITIS.

Treatment.—"In long standing and obstinate cases, more active counteraction to the lumbar region may be required, and we have frequently obtained the most gratifying results from the intermittent application of irritating plaster."

ACUTE CYSTITIS.

Treatment.—"The treatment recommended in Acute Nephritis is applicable to this: the local applications, however, are to be applied over the pubis instead of the lumbar region."

Eclectics, call to mind the writings and lectures of Beach, Morrow and I. G. Jones, on these same diseases, also, your own practice, and draw your own conclusions. If his practice is Eclectic, theirs and yours is not—their teachings are in vain. The treatment laid down in these diseases, in a work designed as a text book for Reformers, is so meagre, indefinite, and confused, that I can view it as "*little less than a burlesque upon the friends of liberal medicine*."

Dr. Jones tells some thing very near the truth in reference to that work; a book so defective that Dr. Newton's colleagues would not notice or review it, because they could say so little in its favor. Dr. Buchanan would not read it for fear he should be asked to give his candid opinion and have to say some thing offensive. All that redeemed it was the literary ability of Dr. Powell. There was some surprise felt that Dr. J. had not more thoroughly exposed its character, but this task he renewed in the American Med. and Surg. Journal, and Dr. N's colleagues could not say a word in his defence. They were as much dissatisfied with the book as they were with Dr. N's lectures, which were read from the book, *verbatim*, after it was published, and

occasionally from Dr. Powell's manuscript, before it was published—some of which lectures, written by Dr. Powell, were published as lectures of Dr. Newton!!

The following extracts from Dr. L. E. Jones' articles in the American Medical and Surgical Journal, show his estimate of the work:

"ERRORS TAUGHT IN MEDICAL COLLEGES."

"The question which he proposes to discuss is this: Is *Inflammation* a healthy or unhealthy state of parts? or is it a diseased or sound condition of the organs or tissues involved? In short, is inflammation a disease, or the mere manifestation of it? Does it constitute any part of the disease, or is it simply a 'healthy' effort of nature to remove or cure some other affection?

I am led to make these inquiries in consequence of the labored efforts of Prof. R. S. Newton, of that College, to establish his favorite hobby, that it [inflammation] is not disease, but a healthy effort of nature to cure disease."

If his position be true, it should be understood and appreciated by all classes of the profession; if erroneous, it should be as widely known, that the remedy may be co-extensive with the injury inflicted by the inculcation of such doctrines."

Dr. Jones, after showing plainly the gross absurdity of such doctrines, continues as follows:

"I can not leave this subject without an expression of surprise that Prof. R. S. Newton should consume so much important time in zealously advocating the doctrines of Dr. Samuel Thomson. I believe Prof. A. Curtis of the 'Physio-Medical College' of this city, and Prof. R. S. Newton of the 'Eclectic Medical Institute,' are the only gentlemen claiming respectable scientific attainments who walk in the foot-steps of Dr. Thomson. Most of his early proselytes have long since renounced his doctrines; but he still has two zealous friends (both Professors in Medical Colleges), who advocate and proclaim his doctrines to their pupils, pure and unadulterated as when they came from the fountain some forty years ago. If these doctrines accord with science, and the enlightened and progressive spirit of the age—if they be rational and demonstrable, they should certainly be promulgated by the professors in all Medical Colleges. If, on the contrary, they are irrational and erroneous, they should not be made to consume the limited and valuable time of Medical Students."

"IS FEVER DISEASE? BY L. E. JONES, M. D."

Messrs. Editors:—

"It is strenuously maintained by Prof. A. Curtis, of the 'Physio-Medical College' of Cincinnati, and by Prof. R. S. Newton, of the 'Eclectic Medical Institute,' that Fever is not a Pathological condition, in other words not disease, but a healthy 'effort of nature' to cure something else, which they call disease. In this connection, it should be remembered that Dr. Samuel Thomson vehemently advocated the same doctrine, in the small work which he published on his method of treating diseases, for which he obtained a Patent from Congress some 40 or 50 years ago."

"While most of his early proselytes and admirers, have long since discarded his doctrines respecting Fever and Inflammation, as erroneous, Profs. Curtis and Newton fearlessly maintain the same old Thomsonian theories in their purity. * * * * *

"If it should be contended that the excited action of the heart and arteries alone constitute the Fever, regardless of all the other morbid phenomena present, still, it does not prove them healthy. If violent arterial action be healthy, then are the cramping and excessive vomiting and purging in cholera morbus—the extreme vascular excitement caused by great loss of blood—the frequent pulse observed in most febrile and inflammatory diseases, and that excessive action of the heart and arteries, observed in the last moments, or in the collapsed stage of Typhus Fever, when the pulse beats from 150 to 160 in a minute. The writer can not conceive that the presence of any of those elements of disease, prove them to be manifestations of health. If Fever is a healthy action, it should be promoted in true Thomsonian style, by the use of Alcoholic stimulants, cayenne pepper, and other potent agents of this class, for the more there is, the better for the safety of the patient. There can be no danger, if raised to the highest possible point of excitement, if it be merely a healthy effort of nature to cure; and the physician who would modify or subdue it, proves himself an ignorant pretender, a mere quack—he proves that he knows nothing about the great laws of life and health."

"To be consistent, Prof. Newton must teach his pupils to view 'Fever as a friend,' and resort to all possible means to augment its strength, or increase its curative power. I leave those who have heard his lectures on Fever and Inflammation, to judge for themselves as to the consistency displayed."

"One thing is certain, if Prof. Newton's teaching, (which is purely Thomsonian, so far as regards Fever and inflammation,) be correct, the Medical Profession should know it, and inculcate the same doctrines to their pupils. Unfortunately (perhaps) for the cause of truth and science, none of the Professors, in any of the Medical Colleges, have become properly enlightened on this subject, with the exception of Professors Curtis and Newton, to whom it remained to review Dr. Thomson's doctrines, and to propagate them in their Colleges, in their pristine purity."

In his second pamphlet, pages 14 and 15, Dr. L. E. J. denounces in strong language the defective teaching of Drs. Newton and Bickley, complaining that the doctrines of Dr. Buchanan are "now said to be fully endorsed by the entire Faculty," which was strictly true, except that nobody had asked Dr. Freeman what his opinions were on that subject, or whether he had any at all. He condemns severely "the exceedingly defective course of teaching on *Theory and Practice and Materia Medica*," and says that students will not be able to sustain an honorable examination on these departments. [Observe, reader, this is on page 14 of the 2d pamphlet of 24 pages. Do not allow Dr. Newton & Co. to offer you the 3d pamphlet of 40 pages for the second, and tell you that these quotations are not in it; all our quotations are made with the utmost care. There is no quotation or statement which does not faithfully and fairly represent the original.]

In his third pamphlet, page 29, he says that the graduates of the Institute are no longer qualified to practice, as they were in former days, on account of the deficient teaching of Newton and Bickley.

"When it is recollected the students of the E. M. I. have but a sickly course of lectures on the two most important departments, *Theory and Practice*, and *Materia Medica*, how must their graduates compare with those of former years."

To illustrate further Dr. Newton's unfitnes, he publishes with approbation and eulogy a letter from an intelligent student, who had graduated, saying, among other things—

"Prof. Newton was always looked upon, during my attendance at the Institute, as an automaton, in the absence of a competent lecturer on *Surgery*, employed to read Dr. Hill's work on that subject."

Complaints of a similar character against the College, for employing a Professor to read lectures out of books, had been accumulating and increasing so long that it is not strange the Faculty and Board determined, at last, to put an end to such incompetency. While Dr. Newton was a Professor, the by-laws of the College prevented the Faculty from exposing his deficiencies when they saw them. As the Professors do not attend each other's lectures they only find out the defects by the complaints to which they give rise in the class. For various reasons students seldom complain, but in the case of Dr. Newton it was discovered in the spring of 1856, that at least three-fourths of the class were dissatisfied or disgusted, and as soon as he was expelled they expressed themselves as follows:

These resolutions and the report of the meeting, were prepared by the students themselves, without any aid or influence from the Faculty; hence, they are written in strong and pointed language, under the influence of the indignation and disgust which had been excited by the conduct of Dr. Newton and his associates. There were a few, who, for various reasons, did not unite in denouncing Dr. Newton, for we believe no man was ever a Professor in a medical school, whatever his character, who could

not ingratiate himself sufficiently to make a few personal friends, even if they considered him incompetent.

The class contained gentlemen of such a grade of intelligence that they were entirely disgusted with his lectures read from books, and interspersed with his own ungrammatical comments.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CLASS.

At a meeting of the Students of the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati, at which forty members of the Class were present (the entire class consisting, at this time, of about fifty Students,) the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, We, the students of the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati, being sensible of the loss which we have sustained, during our attendance as students at the Institute, both from the utter incompetency of R. S. Newton, Professor of Theory and Practice, as a teacher, and from his gross neglect of duty; and in consideration of the fact, that he uses in his practice and advocates the use of Medicinal agents, which are known to be base adulterations, and that there is at this time in his office an established agency for the sale of said preparations, and further in consideration of the fact that he has taken forcible possession of the College building, by stealthily entering it with his friends, in the night, that he and his coadjutors have, by means of deadly weapons, prevented the class from entering the lecture room, with the exception of the few whom he knew to be in favor of himself and his machinations; in consequence of which, the students are now deprived of the instruction which is due them; that he is in alliance with individuals who are, and have been, avowed enemies of the Institute; and finally, in consideration of the fact, that the above are but a few of a long series of wrongs and insults, which the students, as well as the Faculty, have suffered at his hands; and feeling, as we do, that whatever of courtesy or deference may, heretofore, have been due from us, by virtue of the relation which we sustained to him, that "the time to suffer and be silent" is now past, and believing that justice to ourselves, to the Profession, and to the world, demands from us an expression of our sentiments and feelings, with regard to the past condition of affairs; therefore,

Resolved, That as the interests of medical science, and the progress of medical reform, are dependent upon the character and ability of those who are engaged in them, the man, who, pretending to be a physician and teacher, will basely prostitute himself to professional trickery and dishonesty, and use the profession, (involving as it does, so many of the interests of humanity,) for the vile purpose of promoting his own pecuniary interests and personal aggrandizement, merits the honest indignation and severest censure of every friend of medical reform, and of humanity.

Resolved, That we consider R. S. Newton wholly incompetent to fill a Professorship, with credit to himself or the Institution, or with profit to the class; not only from a want of medical knowledge, but also because of his general ignorance.

Resolved, That we believe his boasted authorship to be merely titular, such as any one might obtain who possessed pecuniary means, to secure the labors of others; and notwithstanding his vaunted position in this regard, in his lectures he merely reads to the class from the so-called "Newton and Powell's Practice," verbatim, et literatim, et seriatim.

Resolved, That the course of conduct pursued by R. S. Newton, in recommending, and particularly to the class under his instruction, quack nostrums and adulterated medicines, and in making the Eclectic Medical Journal not only an advertising sheet for worthless agents, but also a channel for virulent attacks upon others, especially upon his brother Professors, merits the severest censure.

Resolved, That in consideration of the empirical and unscientific course hitherto pursued by R. S. Newton and his associate, Z. Freeman, together with the alliance which they have formed with avowed enemies of the Institute and of Eclecticism, we regard them as foes of the Eclectic Reform, as well as of the Eclectic Medical Institute, and denounce, as an act unworthy physicians or men, the means to which they have resorted for the purpose of breaking down the Institute, by betraying it Judas-like into the hands of its foes.

Resolved, That the connection of R. S. Newton with the Eclectic Medical Institute, has done much to bring discredit upon the College and lower the character and

standing of Eclectic physicians, in the estimation of the community.

Resolved, That his mobocratic demonstration in forcibly debarring the faculty and the students from the College building, after having signally failed in his attempt to embarrass their operations by a process of law, by the cowardly exhibition of bowie knives and pistols, amputating knives, crowbars and other such weapons, and to intimidate, by cannon, those whom words could not awe, together with the character of the persons employed by him, to assist in maintaining insurrectionary possession of the College building, are all characteristic of the man, and indicative of the spirit and motives which have prompted the series of provocations and annoyances, which have so much marred the harmony and retarded the advancement of the class—for the welfare of which, he has hypocritically professed such tender regard.

Resolved, That the act of R. S. Newton and associates in forcibly taking possession of the College building, upon an assumed right, which is now being contested in law, we regard and condemn as an act of usurpation.

Resolved, That R. S. Newton, believing success in the legal controversy in which he has engaged altogether improbable, is endeavoring to effect his purpose of destroying the Institution by pushing a series of petty annoyances to such an extent, that the students, becoming harassed and discouraged, shall leave the Institution, and that he has so far succeeded in his base designs, that a considerable number of the students have already returned home.

Resolved, That while we feel called upon to reprobate the course pursued by Drs. Newton and Freeman as medical teachers and as men—we take great pleasure in expressing our entire satisfaction with the other members of the faculty, and their labors as medical instructors, as well as our gratification at their pacific and gentlemanly bearing in the late controversy into which they have unwillingly been driven.

Resolved, That as students and friends of the Institute and of Eclecticism, our sympathy and co-operation are, and ever shall be, with those who have stood by and upheld both; while for the traitor to humanity and to truth, whose efforts are to obscure with dust the brightness he can not emulate, and to tear down that which he cannot attain, in order that he may reign over the ruins, we have only the bitterest reprehension for his conduct and pity for his utter destitution of those manly qualities which enoble and adorn humanity.

R. P. WHITE, Chairman.

J. DAVISON, Secretary.

The foregoing resolutions were also voluntarily signed by thirty-three members of the class, to give the additional force of their *personal testimony* and cordial approbation. Among the names of the signers were:

W. E. KEMBLE,	JNO. L. MORRILL,
COMLY JESSOP,	JAS. TALLMADGE,
PEYTON W. HENRY,	D. Y. CHALFANT,
M. W. HENRY,	F. M. TATE,
T. K. DASHIELL,	H. G. OSGOOD, &c., &c.

These resolutions were published in a Cincinnati daily, with editorial remarks. "These resolutions (said the editor) show that the great majority of the students have undiminished confidence in and respect for the Faculty."

Dr. L. E. Jones denounced, also, what had often been denounced by numbers of the class—Dr. Newton's clinical speculation, which consisted in getting the Faculty to appropriate one-fifth of the proceeds of their tuition fees to support a *hospital for clinical instruction*, then renting out the so-called hospital as a boarding house, and introducing *dispensary patients* from the street [which might have been done without a pretended clinic, as it had been done gratuitously by Prof. Morrow, at the College], and finally, after getting a large revenue from the College, for an affair of so little value, appropriating the whole credit to himself, by calling it *Newton's Clinic*, after he had agreed to discontinue that assumption and let it stand forth as it really was, a clinical lecture room, maintained, not by Dr. Newton, but by the College. This double cheat, of sub-

stituting Dispensary practice, to which the Faculty had long been accustomed, for the hospital practice which had been promised, and finally, monopolizing it by name as his own exclusively, was a constant source of dissatisfaction in the Faculty and class; and Dr. Newton's first hostility to his colleagues arose from the fact that they were dissatisfied, and at length discussed the necessity of yielding to the demands of the class, and giving them access to a *bona fide* Hospital, where they could see something valuable in Pathology and Surgery. Fruitful, however, in the expedients of the charlatan, the poverty of the clinic was made up by giving out clinical diplomas, signed by himself, his "learned brother" and Dr. Freeman, which enabled those who had attended as spectators, thirty-two clinics, *such as they were*, to show more parchment than could be exhibited by a student of all the Hospitals of Europe! The class, said Dr. L. E. Jones,

"Abhor the compulsory \$5 ticket of admission to the empty wards of a private speculation, called a 'clinic.'"—p. 25, 3d pamphlet.

Did any of the Faculty ever deny that accusation, excepting, perhaps, Dr. Freeman, after he became interested?

The final death-blow from Dr. L. E. J., the concentrated extract of his opinion of Dr. N., *unadulterated with any magnesia*, is found on pages 29, 30, 31, 32 of the 3d pamphlet.

L. E. JONES' OPINION OF R. S. NEWTON—NEWTON'S QUERIES AGAINST S. C. BURTON—PUBLIC OPINION OF NEWTON AND HIS EXPRESS.

"In the next place, I will introduce articles from the Daily Commercial of this city, respecting the villainous attack of R. S. Newton upon Sidney C. Burton, together with his *profound* 'Queries,' and no less *profound* defense. The design of these 'Queries,' it is true, is partially obscured by lugging in unmeaning ones on other matters, thus attempting to cover one base act by another; but still the wit and low cunning of their author do not disguise the malicious design. Spanish or Mexican treachery is but too apparent—want of a 'high moral and intellectual character' are clearly seen.

"The deep interest of the citizens of Cincinnati in the 'Martha Washington Trial,' sixteen human beings having lost their lives by the burning of that boat, and the conspicuous part which S. C. Burton has taken in it, with the self-evident design on the part of the author of those 'Queries' lend an unusual interest to them. His design, (though an Abolitionist in the North, and a member of an Abolition society,) appears to have been to excite a feeling of hatred and suspicion in the minds of slaveholders in Arkansas against Burton—perhaps jeopardise his life—defeat justice and a fair trial, by flooding that state with these *low* and contemptible 'Queries,' insinuating that he (Burton) was there to steal or run off their negroes—that he had a slave depot at Cleveland, Ohio—that he had some Abolition agency and much business with Canadian Anti-Slavery men, &c., &c., and when it is known that the strong popular feeling in Cincinnati, in favor of S. C. Burton, caused Spanish cowardice to suppress these 'Queries' in the 'Northern Edition' of his 'Express,' for fear of the overwhelming outburst of indignation which would have been hurled against him, and in the same number, (Northern Edition,) and in the place of these 'Queries,' insert an article on the school question, it truly exhibits a piece of villainy not equaled by the imputed libeling a moral young lady with an 'intellectual character,' for his queries involve the guilt or innocence of persons charged with destroying the lives of sixteen innocent persons. But read the *muddy* intellectual queries with the filth interspersed, to partially cover their design—then the first article from the Editor of the Daily Commercial—then R. S. Newton's obscure reply—notice his positive denial, and then admission in the same short article, and lastly, the Commercial's rejoinder.

"No wonder the author of those queries felt ashamed of them, and wished to hide them from the intelligent citizens of Cincinnati. As to the villainy of such acts, I leave the public to judge. I learn that one of the public journals in Northern Ohio, publicly declared the author of those 'Queries' was undeserving life.

"If a man is 'right—perfectly right—gentlemen, upon the School Question,' that does not authorize him to ACT THE SCOUNDREL in other respects.

"QUERIES.

"Who can tell whether S. C. Burton or the Martha Washington men are the greatest * * * * *

"Who knows the men now living on Fourth Street, worth one hundred thousand dollars, made by burning steam boats on the Western waters? Who knows when S. C. Burton will commence to investigate this case, and make many other wonderful and miraculous revelations?

"Who knows whether these men can be convicted without any one having to travel fourteen thousand miles in ten days, one-half of this to be performed on the back of an Ass to procure witnesses, and whether they will be convicted, hung, and then killed.

"Who has twelve thousand dollars to give to one poor man, who already has as much money as he wants?

"Who knows the man that didn't shoot a woman sometime since on Third street?

"Who knows how Wash McQuay got to Canada from the South?

"Who knows all the directors of the underground railroad through Ohio?

"Who keeps the underground depot at or near Cleveland, Ohio?

"Who knows the man that has so much business at the negro settlement in Canada?

"Who knows what became of Uncle Tom after he died and was 'killed by Old Lagree'?

"Who knows the man that will be employed by the Government to bring the Counsellors and Attorneys of the late Dr. Gardner to justice?

"Who knows when Cuba will be annexed and Mexico attached to this country?

"Who knows whether the expediency of establishing an agency for the underground railroad at Helena, Arkansas, has been settled, and who is to be the general agent?

"Who knows whether or not the delegates from this State, now at that place, will decide the above question? If at home, some of them could be quite eloquent upon this subject: but perhaps while they are there, they are *much* enough to make our Southern friends think them all clever fellows, as they really are 'in a horn,' or a 'horn in them.'"—[Newton's Express.]

[From the Cincinnati Commercial, May, 1854.]

"Sidney C. Burton—Slandrous attempts to render him odious in Arkansas—A Model Medical Journal.

"One of the most pitiable evidences of the corruption of the times is to be found in the exceedingly low rates at which men in respectable positions sell themselves to the commission of dishonorable acts. A case has come to our knowledge of so strange a character, that we have been as much inclined to be surprised as indignant, at the conduct of the persons implicated; to whom, while we should hesitate to impute deliberate malice, we cannot but attribute a standard of moral consciousness, exceedingly degraded. In these times, when the public is so much agitated in regard to the illegitimate means that have, both here and elsewhere, been employed to defeat the ends of justice, disturb the equilibrium of judicial action, and place obstacles in the way of legal prosecutions in cases of great crimes against society, such an act as we are about to notice becomes doubly censurable, because it is done in the face of an active public sentiment of which no one can be supposed to be ignorant.

"Sidney C. Burton is well known as an active agent in the prosecution of the persons charged with the burning of the steamer Martha Washington. This has rendered him the subject of much persecution, slander, and abuse, commencing with the defendants and their counsel and associates; and extending to others who through sympathy or venality have been induced to take the part of the accused. Among the most common means that have been resorted to against Mr. Burton, has been that of enlisting, by means of bribery or otherwise, the most worthless and profligate of the conductors of the public press in the business of maligning his character generally, or in making specific charges of venality, falsehood, perjury, and a variety of other crimes, with the intent to destroy his influence and credibility, and to place him in the light of a remorseless persecutor of the honest and innocent. Even while the prosecutions in Arkansas are going on, there is a certain class of the press here that devotes its

columns to the publication of articles intended for the southern latitude; some idea of the extent and variety of which may be gained by the following incident, which has come to our knowledge:

"There is a little medical journal in this city, known by the name of 'Newton's Express.' It is published by a certain Dr. Newton, and its pages are devoted to the dissemination of intelligence appertaining to the Eclectic school, of which we believe the Doctor is a Professor. The State of Arkansas has recently been flooded with numbers of this journal, got up expressly for that market, and containing in the form of interrogatories addressed to the people, the most false and unfounded charges against Mr. Burton, calculated to render him odious, if not to endanger his personal safety. They are inquired of, among other things, if they are not aware that he is an Abolitionist—if they do not know that he is among them for the purpose of aiding their negroes to escape—and if these prosecutions are not instituted for the purpose of giving him an opportunity to steal their slaves. This is bad enough; but what is meaner, more curious and more cowardly than all, is the fact that the same number of the journal, intended for circulation hereabouts, does not contain the article in question. It was carefully cancelled in the *Northern* edition, and its place supplied with other matter. When a man commits an act of doubtful morality, and of *undoubted dishonor*, endeavoring at the same time to *conceal* it, it is evident that he *thinks himself a scoundrel*: and to that extent his opinion should command implicit belief."

"DR. R. S. NEWTON.

"We give place in another column, to a communication from Dr. R. S. Newton, in which he endeavors to exculpate himself from blame, for the publication of an article in a periodical of his own, calculated to prejudice the minds of the people of Arkansas against the prosecuting witness in the trial of the Martha Washington defendants, and thereby disturb the course of justice. That we may become obnoxious to no charge of partiality in the premises, we have permitted Dr. Newton to use his own language, offensive and unfounded as are some of his remarks, holding that the facts of the case are all in which the public is interested, and believing that harsh words coming from a man in the position in which he stands, are more likely to damage his own cause, than to inflict an injury upon the party against whom they are employed. It is not necessary for us to say that, in our opinion his vindication is exceedingly lame, for in that respect, the public is the party entitled to pronounce judgment. We claim no authority for our own views, beyond the reasons upon which they are founded; and have no desire so strong as that Dr. Newton may establish for himself a complete defense in the eyes of the community."

"In his communication, Dr. Newton pursues the course usually chosen by men who have been detected in the commission of acts, whose exposure would render them infamous. So far as he *knows* the facts to be susceptible of proof, they are admitted, with an attempt to do away their force by an explanation; so far as he *doubts* the ability of the charging party to produce the testimony, he puts on the air of an injured man, and pleads 'not guilty'; and at the same time he asks the public to believe that his intentions were all fair and honorable. Whether the general character of Dr. Newton is such as to furnish the ground of a presumption in his favor sufficient to overcome the evidence in the case, is not for us to determine. Since modern progress has so strikingly enlarged the right of *self defense*, in our courts of justice, it is difficult to determine precisely what a man may do, who can bring a crowd of witnesses to testify to the good qualities which they deem it possible he may number among his possessions. In the meantime, we have no desire to over-state the testimony, to go beyond any rational rule of evidence, nor to cut off any presumption legitimately deducible from the circumstances. 'Let justice be done, though the Heavens may fall.'

"We do not desire to conceal from the public, the fact that we have never seen the article of which we spoke on Wednesday. Our knowledge of it is derived from the relation of respectable gentlemen in the city, in whose word we have the most implicit confidence. We did not profess to quote it, as Dr. Newton very well understands; but gave in guarded language, from the lips of others, its general drift and purport. The charge of misquotation, therefore, which Dr. Newton makes against us, is a fallacy which he would fain have understood as a denial that the article contained the obnoxious features it was alleged to

embody. In reply to all this, it is sufficient to say that we have tendered to Dr. Newton, and now do it again, the use of our columns for its republication. By every rule of reason and law, he is precluded from giving evidence of the contents of a document in his own possession, other than the thing itself. *Let him produce it. His failure to do so is the ground of a presumption against him, stronger than any testimony that we can adduce, or any argument that we can construct.* Such a publication is the primary requisite in his defense, without which a vindication is impossible.

"Whether Dr. Newton wrote the article himself, and published it at his own suggestion, or whether it was the production of another, and inserted for a *consideration*, is of little consequence in determining the character of the act. To settle that question would be merely to decide whether he was *depraved by unwholesome association*, or by the *instincts of a native venality*. These things we say with regret. Our personal relations with Dr. Newton have been kindly; but we can not look upon that man as a safe member of society, who can assume the honorable calling of the conductor of the public press, for the purpose of making that press the vehicle of *cowardly and unfounded slander*, or an engine to retard and disturb the course of public justice.

"Dr. Newton denies that he had any acquaintance with the Martha Washington defendants, except in a slight degree with Cummings; and wishes us to infer from that fact, that he had no sinister motive for the publication of the article in question. It is very possible that his association with those individuals has been limited, but the inference he would deduce from that circumstance, is too violent to be entertained. There are other facts which belong to the same connection. In spite of a guarded and technical denial, it is true, that the papers containing the article, were sent to Arkansas, in large—in unusual quantities, and were circulated there freely. It is true that the impression of the *Express* designed for circulation at home did not contain it. Whether it was in those papers sent North or South, for exchanges, is of no consequence. It was concealed from the public here, and the first advices of its existence which reached Cincinnati, was from Helena, the place where it was intended to operate. If this business was done so openly as he would insinuate, let him prove it; for we apprehend the public will need some testimony more tangible than his assertion, in a matter in which his interest is so strongly implicated.

"But the worst and most conclusive feature of the whole, consists in the position of Dr. Newton himself. The article, in substance, charges Burton with being an Abolitionist, and engaged in the business of aiding slaves to escape. Dr. Newton—although there is ground for the suspicion that he has one edition of his principles for the North, and another for the South—is known here as an Abolitionist, and has been, if he is not now, a member of an Abolition society. As an Abolitionist, he could not but hold Abolition principles and practices in Burton to be laudable; and acting in conformity with his own professions, he could not do otherwise than speak in their praise. What motive then, but a corrupt one, can be conceived for a false, malignant and covert attack upon a man for entertaining principles similar to his own? As an act of mere wantonness, it is incredible. Men do not belie their own professions for amusement; and under the circumstances we can neither apologise to Dr. Newton for the language we have heretofore employed, nor acquit him of the charge we have made of being guilty of an offense that no man can commit without rendering himself *worthy of an infamous notoriety.*"

It may be thought that it is unnecessarily attacking private character to publish that Dr. L. E. J. pronounced Dr. Newton "*a scoundrel*," but, it will be observed that this is a public matter, and that it relates simply to his flagitious conduct, as an editor, which the press condemned as venal and *dishonorable*. Let it be observed, that notwithstanding the terrible castigation which he received, Dr. Newton had really *no defence*. He neither defended his conduct, nor *apologized for his crime*. His response consisted, not in showing that his slanders were true (he never dared to make such an assertion), but merely in trying to show that he had not been quite so *clandestine* as the Commercial charged; but his statement on this point was *not supported by Mr. Lawyer*, the printer, in whose office the trick was

performed; and Mr. L. will not say it was true. The infamy of the act lies, not merely in its cunning secrecy, but in its *assassin-like purpose*, and its *utter falsehood*; it would have been thoroughly criminal without the extra meanness of the concealment. Knowing what Dr. Newton has done in this case, *without APOLOGY or REPENTANCE*, can any one doubt that if, in any other case, *honest men* were engaged in a struggle against *fraud and violence*, Dr. Newton would be very apt to sympathize with the fraudulent, and to assist them, by the same assassin-like charges, *secretly circulated*. We have no doubt that he has, in this very manner, secretly made battle for adulterated medicines, against a Faculty struggling to uphold professional honesty.* We may judge of his secret slanders from the character of his public calumnies.

The depraved character of Newton's Express, and the manner in which its editor sought to use it as an instrument of power, was alluded to by Dr. L. E. Jones, in 1853, showing, that from its editor's unscrupulous character, it was ready to be used, at any time, to blacken the reputation of young men, commencing their professional career. Thus, it enjoyed the same kind of influence which is exercised by the scandalous black-mail sheets of the worst class of publications.

This has been fully verified since; a large number of graduates of the Institute have been assailed by name, in the Express, because they would not sustain Dr. N., and pay for his worthless diplomas. He supposes, that by gratuitously puffing those who patronize him, or those who have not actively opposed him, and denouncing, personally, those who refuse to sustain him, he can drive a considerable number into the support of his spurious organization. Whether the profession will tolerate such "*Satanic press*" manoeuvres remains to be seen.

Such was the exposition by Dr. L. E. Jones, in 1854, of the professional character of Dr. Newton. Coarse and vindictive as his language was, his specific accusations against Dr. Newton were generally based on facts, and although Dr. Newton was defended by the Committee of Eclectic Physicians from the previous attack, the third pamphlet received no answer. It was not convenient then to make any answer. The members of the Faculty were not willing to say that Dr. Newton was a learned, or even a well-qualified teacher—their defense would have been too lame to do him much service. But the pamphlet had very little weight, because it contained so many misstatements and misrepresentations of well known facts, and manifested such a *rancorous malice*, it was very little regarded; and moreover, as the Committee of Eclectic Physicians, of which Dr. Powell was chairman, remarked, Dr. L. E. Jones himself "*HAD NOT SUFFICIENT CHARACTER FOR VERACITY.*"

The pamphlets of Dr. L. E. Jones were unintentionally of great service to Dr. Newton, for the majority of the Faculty, as early as the spring of 1854, had become deeply disgusted and dissatisfied with Dr. Newton, and nothing did so much to uphold him as the fact that he and the Faculty, generally,

were assailed by Dr. L. E. Jones. The Faculty were not willing to aid Dr. L. E. Jones, by making a violent rupture in the college, and throwing Dr. Newton overboard to unite with Dr. Jones, as it was even then affirmed by Dr. Bickley, that he was capable of doing. [Dr. Bickley understood him then, and knew him to be a desperate demagogue.] Dr. Newton was sustained and borne with, simply because he was a selfish and dangerous man, who would not hesitate to destroy that which he could not make profitable to himself. He was of little scientific utility as he was, but dangerous as he might be; as an old writer says of some people, that they are like a crumb of bread in the throat, which gives very little nourishment if it goes right, and a great deal of annoyance if it goes wrong.

The chief value of Dr. Newton to the Institute was as a publisher, a business man, and a politician. He attended to matters which no one else of the Faculty wished to engage in, and for such purposes he was considered desirable.

All the reputation that he has ever acquired for science, has been acquired by three methods; 1st. By getting into the company of scientific men; 2d. By getting scientific men to write for him, and prepare articles or books to be published in his name; and 3d. By a system of advertising and puffing.

The Faculty announcements, of course, spoke as favorably as possible of Dr. Newton. The Dean set forth the pretensions of Dr. Newton according to his own claims and statements, without knowing any thing of the character of his lectures, which he had not heard. Yet with all the desire existing to uphold the Faculty against outside attacks, there is no instance on record in which the Dean ever pronounced him a *man of learning, an able professor, a competent teacher, a man of fine talents, or even competent to authorship*. During the year of his first appointment, not one complimentary word was published in reference to Dr. Newton, as was customary in reference to other professors. During the second year, 1852, the same silence was observed. During the third and fourth years, 1853 and 1854, he was complimented as a *mode of helping him against the attacks of Dr. L. E. Jones*, by describing his mode of lecturing as *stated by himself*, and speaking of him as the most prominent *Eclectic practitioner and surgeon in Cincinnati*, (where he had so little Eclectic competition,) a prominence gained by the arts of advertising chiefly—also by referring to his having had the proper education, or "*preparation*," and to the wonderful success which he *claimed* in practice. In 1853, having lost all confidence in Dr. Newton's veracity, the Dean struck out of the Announcement all reference to Dr. Newton's *wonderful success*, as claimed by himself, and to his mode of lecturing, since the character of his lectures became somewhat known to his colleagues, saying nothing in his behalf, except to refer the reader to what was known of his reputation, and to his "*success and standing as a practitioner*," to which Dr. Newton added, in the printing office, "*one of the authors of Newton's and Powell's Practice of Medicine.*" The Dean, through politeness, allowed the interlineation to remain as the book was among the text books which Dr. Newton announced for his department. I have been particular to explain this matter, as it seems to be the only peg upon which Dr. Newton hangs his hopes, of credit for scientific knowledge, and he is continually parading boastfully the partial recognition which he once received from those who were forbidden to criticise him.

*Since the opinion was formed, it has been verified to the letter. Dr. Newton, following in his own footsteps, regardless of the past denunciations of the press, has brought out again a batch of queries in his scurrilous Express, of such a character that no one could have written them who had not become *callous to all sense of shame*. They are of the same character as his infamous Martha Washington articles, and convey the insinuation that members of the Faculty are connected with the underground railroad—a wilful, malicious and groundless fabrication as he knows.

JONES ON BALDRIDGE.

Dr. L. E. Jones' opinion of Dr. Baldrige, in 1849, was the same that was generally entertained by the Faculty and class, and was not concealed, for he spoke contemptuously of his capacity as a teacher, considered him unfit for a professorship, and although they had been personal friends, he united with the Faculty in inducing Dr. B to resign, simply on account of his *gross incompetency*; after which he shared with the entire Faculty the hostility and opposition of Dr. Baldrige and his friends, and defended the Institute from their abuse in the fall of 1851. It is not necessary now to republish his article from the Eclectic Journal of 1851. Suffice it to say, that he emphatically denied the charges of Dr. Baldrige's friends, declaring of the Faculty of which Dr. Buchanan was a member, and the Dean,

"Not a single man in the Faculty inclines to either Allopathy or Hunkerism, or to Homœopathy, further than a spirit of enlightened and liberal investigation should prompt him.

Again he says:

"Indeed the school, as now organized, enjoys a *greater freedom from either influence* than it has at any former period since the charter was obtained." See pamphlet published by Faculty, 1853, page 9.

The Baldrige party were pronounced calumniators by Dr. L. E. Jones, for this stupid Allopathic, Homœopathic story. But when expelled himself, he took up the same story which he had previously denounced as false in Dr. Baldrige's friends. For doing so he was himself denounced and exposed by Dr. Newton, Dr. Powell, and the entire Faculty and class, and yet the same old, stale, inconsistent story, ragged with old age and hard usage, has been picked up by Dr. Newton as soon as he was expelled and circulated in the Express, in the form of innuendo, implication, suggestion, and every style in which a hunted down calumny crawls into sight again. No one knows better than Dr. Newton, that all such insinuations are base attempts to impose upon parties unacquainted with the Institute.

JONES ON FREEMAN AND SANDERS.

As to Dr. Z. Freeman, Dr. L. E. Jones having known him as a student, and subsequently as demonstrator and lecturer on anatomy, was able to appreciate his value. He became disgusted with Dr. Freeman as a Professor, on account of his want of reliability, and several other charges of a grave nature. In the spring of 1852, this disgust came to a crisis. The Faculty generally regarded Dr. Freeman's services as of but little value, and when Dr. Jones denounced him, and made grave charges, they did not care to protect him. Dr. Freeman perceived the general dissatisfaction, and surrendered his office in a conditional, indefinite way, and left the city, hoping to be recalled by the Faculty. Dr. L. E. Jones admits, in his pamphlet, that he concurred with Drs. R. S. Newton, I. G. Jones, and J. K. Buchanan, in reference to the "*dismissal of Dr. Freeman*," and appointment of Dr. Sherwood in his place, but claims that Dr. Buchanan took the lead in reference to this removal or change. It is not material who took the lead, but it is certain that Dr. L. E. Jones was the chief opponent of Dr. F. The rest of the Faculty thought him lacking in talent and reliability, but Dr. L. E. Jones was determined that he should not hold a position in the same school with himself, and in the latter part of 1852, wrote to Dr. Buchanan, urging him to write to Dr. Freeman, somewhere in the south, to prevent his coming to Cincinnati, and trying again to occupy

his chair, to which Dr. Sherwood was to be appointed if he would accept.

"If Sherwood does not take the chair of Anatomy, we shall want him (K.), and if he (S.) does, it may be best to get K***. Write what are your views on the subject. Another matter—Newton says you ought to write to Freeman, and let him know that he is not wanted, or he will be up and will not resign, and we shall have trouble with him. He and S. (Sanders) have left Memphis, and we do not know where they are, but could you not write to Memphis and have the letter forwarded. Write to him *at once, and let him know what is the decision in his case.*"—(L. E. Jones, July 22, 1852.)

An important reason for the removal of Dr. Freeman according to Dr. L. E. Jones, lay in certain accusations which he made against the character and deportment of Drs. Freeman and Sanders—charges so strenuously urged against Dr. Freeman, that he threatened Dr. Jones with a prosecution, and in 1853 he manifested extreme anxiety to have Dr. L. E. Jones punished severely for his personal attacks, although he did not prosecute him. Whether these personal accusations were true or false, we leave to be adjusted between the parties—it is not material whether in this case Dr. Jones was a slanderer or Dr. Freeman was something worse, for it is not intended to discuss private character, our subject being professional. It is sufficient to show how deeply and sincerely these parties esteem each other in consequence of being too well acquainted. Dr. Freeman hovered around the Institute after being dropped out, intrigued among the students, and after the expulsion of Dr. L. E. Jones, obtained the vacancy, in consequence of being the only candidate.

Prof. J. M. Sanders stood still lower in the estimation of Dr. L. E. Jones than Dr. Freeman. The same personal charges were made against him by Dr. Jones. He affirmed that both Freeman and Sanders "*cared for nothing but the honors and emoluments of the E. M. I.,*" and ridiculed the titles of Sanders. Like Freeman, Sanders withdrew in the summer of 1852, to the general satisfaction of all parties, followed by sundry maledictions of Dr. L. E. Jones alone, for the liberties he had taken in carrying off certain apparatus, denouncing also Dr. Newton for permitting it. No member of the Faculty wished to recall J. M. Sanders. after this trial of his capacities, and Dr. L. E. Jones especially exulted greatly in the improvement made, by giving his department to Dr. Hoyt, an opinion in which all concurred.

JONES ON BICKLEY.

Of Dr. BICKLEY, Dr. L. E. Jones says: "Think you Eclectics, his feeble intellect is adequate to the dissemination of the great truths of American Medical Reform? Can graduates be honored and respected who have his insignia." (2nd pamphlet, page 16.)

Again, he predicts the ruin of the cause "*if such feeble and frivolous minds are to control medical reform.*" Again, "*it was said hundreds of times by his class, they would not give three cents for all they should learn from him—that they should leave knowing as little about Materia Medica as when they came.*" Page 15.

"I thought Prof. Buchanan had more regard for truth than common, when he wrote me, and the best recommendation he could give of Prof. Bickley's fitness for the important chair he now holds, was that he '*is a shonny man*'—*dressed fine, and has a good address;*" and again, "*I don't consider him a deep man, nor a very strong man.*"

In the resolutions gotten up by himself and privately adopted at his own house, by a small squad of conspirators, (signed by Dr. Baldrige, as chairman of the meeting,) he speaks of Dr. Bickley as having "*disgraced himself,*" and "*rendered himself deserving of the scorn and contempt of all honorable members of the profession.*" It is to be hoped that Drs. Jones and Baldrige will not express their scorn

and contempt, to Dr. Bickley every day, although Dr. Bickley might not choose to notice it, as he has said of Dr. L. E. Jones—"It is not becoming the dignity of a gentleman to quarrel with a man so lost to every principle of honor." (Letter from Dr. Bickley, July 7th, 1853, now in my possession.)

The 15th resolution of Jones and Baldrige reads as follows: "15. That Prof. Bickley is a good reader, but no teacher of medicine, that he knows but little about Eclecticism practically—that he is therefore incompetent to teach it, and that his peculiar province is in the broad field of novelty, romance and fiction."

In the same batch of resolutions, Dr. Jones, Baldrige & Co., pronounced, among others, Drs. Bickley and Freeman "incompetent to impart practical instruction," and Drs. Bickley and Newton to be "but recent converts to Eclecticism, if indeed they be not still Allopathic in sentiment." (1st pamphlet, page 24.)

Not satisfied with charging Dr. B. with frivolity weakness and incompetency, he brings forward the graver charge of PLAGIARISM, as follows. Any one who has a feeling of curiosity on this subject can compare the two books together. There are copies of both in Cincinnati:

DR. L. E. JONES ON BICKLEY'S PLAGIARISM.

"Since giving the Dr. credit for what he claims—i. e. his lectures 'are the product of his own brain, and not taken from the original ideas of others,' I find I have been too liberal, for a review of his 'Physiological Botany,' reveals nothing not found in other works on the same subject—not a single new thought—all a plagiarism—I challenge the proof that it contains any original or new ideas. In a work styled 'Popular Physiology of Plants,' the reader will find the same matter—especially on the subject of light and heat of plants, electricity, movement, contractility, reproduction, change of growth of the stem downward, by reflected light from a looking-glass, endomose and exogens and endogens, etc. Much of the language is verbatim—the coincidence is striking, as Prof. B. writes 'without the aid of books.'"

To express my candid opinion of Dr. B.'s reputation, I would say, that although his friends may have given him credit for graceful fluency as a speaker, and for a ready stock of ideas, I have never heard that any body considered him a man of good judgment, a sound thinker, or a man of any accuracy and reliability in science, or of any capacity for philosophy.

If Dr. L. E. Jones had been called upon twelve months ago to write an honest report of the character of a school containing Newton, Freeman, Bickley and Sanders, he would have pronounced each one unfit to hold a professorship, and the whole group a disgrace to any medical school, with the exception that he considered Dr. Freeman capable of teaching Anatomy. And if the four, Newton, Freeman, Bickley and Sanders, had been all interrogated as to their candid opinion of Dr. L. E. Jones, I would not disgrace the paper by recording their answers, or the epithets they would have used in reply. Such are the candid opinions these men have entertained of each other. Such are the opinions they still entertain. Each one believing, with entire sincerity, that his associates, with but a few exceptions, are dishonest and unfit for professorships. Each one has declared, in times past, that several of his present associates deserved to be expelled from the Eclectic Medical Institute, as unfit to be associated with such men as its present faculty.

Dr. L. E. Jones considered it a slander to compare Dr. Newton with his "sickly course on Practice," to so able and eminent a Professor as Dr. I. G. Jones. He pronounced Dr. Bickley weak and frivolous, a man of feeble intellect, vastly inferior to himself—but even in his paroxysm of rage, he spoke of Dr. Buchanan's "commanding talents," (letter of Dr. L. E. Jones) and conceded to him "all the superiority" in literary attainments that he could possibly claim, (page 8, 2d pamphlet). Dr. Baldrige he aided to remove. Dr. King (his own choice) was one of the Faculty whom he complimented as the best organization the school had ever had. Dr. Hoyt he eulogized and recommended as urgently, on account of his scholarship, fidelity, and fitness, etc., as he had previously denounced J. M. Sanders for unfitness. Dr. Freeman he was glad to get rid of, and fearful he might return to annoy the Professor of Anatomy.

DR. NEWTON'S STRANDING WITH THE FACULTY.

Next to Dr. L. E. Jones, upon whose stock the whole faction sprung into existence, and whose breath could annihilate it, Dr. NEWTON is the embodiment. It is necessary, therefore, that his colleagues should candidly report to the

public their knowledge of his endowments and qualifications. Dr. L. E. Jones, as we have seen, considers him one of the most unsound, incompetent pretenders to Eclectic teaching, destitute of truth, and prone to assassin-like attacks upon character. Dr. Baldrige, according to the testimony of Dr. W. Byrd Powell, (see proceedings of Eclectic Physicians) considered him, in 1849, not fit for a professorship, and "not of the right grit," as to his Eclecticism. The organ of Dr. Baldrige's medical school, (the abortion at Louisville) denounced Dr. Newton's unfitness, and his old school proclivities. (We can not attach any value it is true to Dr. B.'s opinions. But if he is fit to lecture now, still further advanced in age as he is, he was still more fit to give an opinion in 1849.)

Dr. Bickley was one of the first, if not the first man in the Faculty, to censure the character and conduct of Dr. Newton, as exhibited toward the Faculty in 1853, and when the notorious publication of Dr. Newton against Sidney C. Burton, brought down on him the terrible censures of the press, Dr. Bickley was, of all the Faculty, the most disgusted and indignant against Dr. Newton; so much so, that he wrote his resignation forthwith, although, upon consultation with the Faculty, he consented to withhold it. Drs. Hoyt, King, and myself, were all disgusted and indignant alike. Dr. Buchanan also regarded the act as worthy of the severest censure. So thoroughly was Dr. Bickley convinced of the deleterious influence of Dr. Newton's character and conduct upon the progress of American Eclecticism, that he proposed to Drs. King and Freeman an agreement to unite and co-operate with each other in breaking down his influence and thwarting his machinations, and even wrote an article of agreement, the language of which is not recollected, but the purpose of which was to unite the subscribers against Dr. Newton, and in professional co-operation. At this time, while these three gentlemen were agreed in sentiment adverse to Dr. Newton, Dr. Buchanan being of a less impulsive temperament, did not anticipate the necessity of coming to a rupture or a state of discord, as his aim had always been to preserve harmony in the school, and when changes were necessary, to let them be peacefully effected, as was the case in a majority of the changes. That Dr. Newton was both incompetent and injurious to the College, as a Professor, was the opinion of a majority of the Faculty, as well as of others who had an opportunity of judging in 1854. In 1855, the opinion was unanimous, but personal motives, resentments, and interests, led Dr. Freeman to combine with him. None of us ever considered Dr. Newton a man of science or intellectual ability; but his usefulness as a man of business, of political tact and publishing enterprise, caused his scientific deficiencies to be tolerated, until we had discovered, by sad experience, that he had greatly lowered the reputation of the school and its graduates.

Dr. Freeman could not fail to perceive Dr. Newton's deficiencies, being in daily contact with him. He was the first to denounce the deficiencies of the so-called clinic, to myself and Prof. Cleaveland, and to point out Dr. Newton's deficiency in anatomical knowledge. He explained his co-operation with Dr. N. by suggesting that he could thus establish himself as a surgeon, at the expense of Dr. N., as the patients could not fail to perceive which was the operator, and which best understood surgical anatomy. He even remarked, that when Dr. Newton was engaged in surgical operations he was sometimes obliged to take the knife from him and finish the operation, which Dr. N. did not know how to perform.

To complete the testimonials of Dr. Newton, I might refer to the expressions of J. M. Sanders, but as they relate to personal, rather than professional matters, I let them pass, with the remark, that these two understand each other's merits, and may at some future time enlighten the public.

It would be more pertinent, perhaps, to illustrate by Dr. Newton's opinion of himself, as exhibited in the fact that his first proposition as a candidate for a professorship in the life-time of Dr. Morrow, was a proposition to subscribe \$2,000 to the stock of the Institute as a bonus, to accompany his election—the proposition, however, did not find favor. His entrance into the Institute, at a time when it was nearly disorganized by death, and changes in the Faculty, was accompanied by the express condition that the older members of the Faculty should hold on to their places, as he had no faith in the capacity of himself and other new appointments, to sustain the Institute without their services. These other members were Dr. Buchanan, Dr. I. G. Jones, and Dr. L. E. Jones. The latter was soon after unanimously expelled as unfit. The former two were the men upon whom he relied, and to

whom he was devoted until he found that they (Dr. I. G. Jones first, and Dr. Buchanan afterward) regarded him as an incumbrance on the Institute. It was then that he unmasked his desperate intrigue, for the subversion of the old organization, by a combination of off-casts, and forgot the "ignorance and inexperience" as a writer which he confessed in 1852; believing, that as he had the entire possession of the only organ by which the school communicated with the public, the Faculty were at his mercy.

DR. BALDRIDGE'S MERITS.

Dr. Baldrige is another of the corps, who needs to be honestly announced and presented to the public as he really is. He has not been so much denounced as Dr. L. E. Jones and Dr. Newton, simply for the reason that he has attracted less notice—his leading characteristics being *senility, dullness* and a singular species of *harmless vanity*. He has been treated with compassionate forbearance by all, as a relic of the past. Dr. L. E. Jones co-operated in procuring his involuntary resignation in 1849.* Drs. Newton and Powell refused him admission into the Memphis Faculty, when they were about to organize it; and each of his associates alike has regarded him as a feeble, harmless old man. Dr. Bickley took a pride in saying of Drs. Baldrige and Jones, in the lecture which he published in 1853, "if such men are Eclectics, then be it known that I am their antipodes." The present associates of Dr. Baldrige are ashamed of him, and their gossip mongers give out, privately, that he is only appointed for a temporary purpose.

The profound aversion, disgust and contempt, entertained by Drs. Newton, Bickley and Freeman toward Drs. Jones and Baldrige can not easily be exaggerated. It had, moreover a good, substantial basis, and is, therefore, the sentiment which *they still entertain*. Similar feelings were, to a great extent, entertained by the enlightened friends of the Institute generally, who regarded them as the offensive off-casts of the College—effete materials. The feelings of Dr. Bickley were expressed in his lecture as follows:

DR. BICKLEY'S OPINION OF JONES, BALDRIDGE AND COMPANY.

"The first time I saw Prof. Jones I was satisfied, merely from the appearance of the man, that if there was any truth in the philosophy of Gall, Spurzheim, Combe, and Buchanan, he must be a very selfish man, and one that would strive to make the rest of the Faculty submit to him in matters pertaining to the Institute. So dissatisfied was I, that I stated to several persons that I was sorry that Dr. Jones and myself had not met previous to the commencement of the course, inasmuch as I did not feel willing to associate with such a man as he appeared to be. With such feelings, of course few of the civilities of life passed between us."

Speaking of the number of students attending Prof. Buchanan's lectures, he says: p. 4, 5, "a circumstance

*As an attempt has been made by Baldrige and Newton to conceal the involuntary resignation or virtual expulsion of Dr. Baldrige, I must refer to the following statement published by the committee of Eclectic Physicians, with the signatures of Dr. W. B. Powell and the others of the committee attached.

After remarking, that "in matters of which we have positive knowledge, Dr. Jones not only disregards the truth but asserts the very opposite of truth." The committee continue (page 8)—

"Let us now inquire if the general statements of Dr. Baldrige can be relied upon as accurate, when judged by what the committee know to be true. One conspicuous statement of Dr. B. refers to the history of the E. M. Institute. He denies that he was removed from office or requested to resign, and affirms in substance, that his resignation was entirely voluntary, and in accordance with a previous intention. This the committee can not believe, as they are too familiar with the facts concerning Dr. B's removal. They must say that his removal was not voluntary on his part, and that Dr. Baldrige as soon as removed was very anxious to procure a Professorship some where else, as well as hostile to his late colleagues for his rejection on account of incompetency. If, then, self-interest would lead Dr. Baldrige to pervert facts of such a nature, when there are so many individuals living who can correct his mis-statements, we do not feel that he is a reliable witness upon any subject in which his own interest or reputation is concerned. Especially, when he is known as having for several years been hostile and abusive toward the E. M. Institute. In addition to these two witnesses, who appear to be unreliable for correct information,"—&c.

which offended our worthy colleague, Prof. Jones, inasmuch as it gave the public an opportunity to judge of Prof. Buchanan's merits, while he (Professor Jones) was left to growl in obscurity over his misfortune, in being denied the ability to appear before an intelligent audience, as the discoverer of those brilliant truths which Prof. Buchanan has, from time to time, declared through the journals of science, or by public lectures in the principal cities of the Union.

"This circumstance gave rise to what the Faculty thought to be ungentlemanly conduct on the part of Prof. Jones, which was aggravated by a similar course toward Prof. King, from a similar cause, and other conduct not to be borne."

Speaking of Dr. Buchanan's appointment as Dean, he says, in his peculiar, verbose style:

"And the cabinet of Eclecticism, in their wisdom, appointed one to fill a post, from the discharge of the duties, of which any mind but that of a *Buchanan* would have swerved, and, instead of leading the Eclectic army into the domain of anti-progression, have retreated to the elements of Thomsonianism."

"From the moment the brilliancy of his intellect and the depth of his philosophy came in contrast with the alchemistic pretensions of his inferiors, a black hatred and a spirit of revenge seem to have fired their breasts; and every burst of popular applause which the indomitable Dean of our Faculty has elicited from the public, by his learning and science, has fanned the little spark of envy into an all-consuming flame, for the satiation of which, even the school and cause of Eclecticism is to be offered up a sacrifice." p. 8.

After denouncing Dr. Jones as a revengeful traitor, comparing him to "*Judas*" and "*Arnold*," he says:

"Supposing it were possible to break down this school (and, it seems, to effect its ruin no screw is to be left unturned), what would be the result? All who have graduated from it, in whatever part of the Union they may live, would suffer, because it is not to be supposed that our anti-eclectic enemies would suffer its failure to remain a secret. When you should be met by the bedside and told that you knew nothing of medical science, could you reply by referring to a diploma which had been granted by a defunct college? I am very sure you would not like to do this."

"If you were to lend your assistance to break down this school, do you think you would be doing that which would promote our cause? Allopaths, Homoeopaths, Physopaths, Hydropaths, Sarsaparillapaths, and Orthopaths, might, and we are to expect they would, be indifferent to, or even desire the destruction of such a school; but, I am not willing to believe that Eclectics of the true stamp will ever tolerate such a thought. It is useless to say to you that this school has already built up a liberal profession, which, in turn, has built up the school. You can not fail to see the important relation which must ever exist between you and your *alma mater*."

"If you do not wish to aid in its overthrow, may I not expect that you will repudiate, with utter contempt, any movements from pseudo-friends, calculated to mar our peace, or disturb the equanimity of our labors?"

"The truth is, I should be much surprised if some of you were not deceived with the constant gossip which has been poured into your ears, by a designing man or his instruments." p. 10, 11, 12.

In reference to the selfishness of Dr. Jones, he says:

"Who will haul down the flag of medical reform, and bow in supplication to the dictates of a mind too small to do aught for the cause of Eclecticism, where self is not taken into consideration? Who will hug a Shylock to his breast, and have his own life's interest supped by the miserly graspings of a Jew." p. 12, 13.

July 7th, 1853.—Dr. Bickley wrote to Dr. Buchanan that he had read Dr. Jones' pamphlet, and that "many of his charges against you are so entirely false that no notice ought to be taken of them, specially. Those which are misrepresented ought to be corrected, and then have the public to understand that it is not becoming the dignity of a gentleman to quarrel with a man so lost to every principle of honor."

Finally, his exact conception of the relative character of Dr. Jones and the object of his slanders, is expressed as follows:

"In answer to this, it is only necessary to inform the public that, since the death of the lamented Morrow, the responsibilities of the school have fallen mostly on the

shoulders of the present Dean, (Jos. R. Buchanan, M. D.), and that without his exertions, in all probability the school would either have had no existence, or been known only to a limited extent. The peculiar views and teachings of Buchanan have been one of the chief sources of attraction to students, as is evidently evinced by all who have matriculated in the school since he became connected with it. Not only so but the public may easily satisfy themselves that it has always fallen on Professor Buchanan to defend the school when assailed by enemies to the cause; and if Professor Jones was the leading spirit of the school, how comes it that its defense has fallen on Prof. Buchanan?

"Professor Jones is comparatively an *obscure individual*, as he does not seem to possess the education necessary to impress his 'TALENTS AND ENERGIES' upon the public. It is a pity, and I sympathize with him; but since his organization does not admit of either vivacity or originality, we must put up with things as we find them. Yet it is strange that a man of Professor Jones' age should not have found out his real condition before; for he seems to have relied on his own 'MONEY, ENERGY AND TALENTS' for a reputation, until his late attempt to save himself by clinging to, and appropriating to himself, the reputation of others. * * * * *

"Then, I deny that I ever did, or ever will occupy a chair in a medical college built up by the 'money, energy and talents' of the said Professor L. E. Jones!"

"I have no wish to be associated with a man who can not even interchange with gentlemen the common civilities of life, or look upon the reputation of others but with feelings of the blackest hatred. That low but dear jewel of little minds, revenge, seems now to be the end and object of the 'MONEY, TALENTS, AND ENERGIES' of Professor Jones. It is, however, only necessary that the public be informed that the (greatly injured) man, finding himself *destitute of the sympathy of gentlemen of worth in the profession*, has gladly called around him some six or seven irresponsible men, whom he has vainly tried to palm on the community as a convention of Eclectic physicians." Pp. 15-16.

That "gentleman of worth" did not sympathize with Dr. Jones at that time, was very true, and is truer, if possible, at present. His plan of upholding himself now, is still the same as above mentioned by Dr. Bickley, viz: by getting a small squad of disappointed, disaffected individuals, and endeavoring to palm them upon the community as proper representatives of Eclecticism.

Nothing but the most desperate circumstances, however, could have driven such men, still smarting under the denunciations of Dr. L. E. Jones, to humble themselves before him, and accept a fictitious position, based entirely upon his votes as stockholder. Of course they will get rid of him as speedily as possible, when opportunity offers, and then apologize for being in his company, by the necessity of the case which required his aid. Dr. Jones, however much he despises them, can not get rid of them, for he can do nothing alone.

The language of Dr. Bickley, however, was not adequate to doing full justice to Jones and Baldrige. It required Drs. Newton and Powell to finish the picture, the foulest portions being reserved for Dr. Newton, who delights in such subjects.

When Dr. Powell, as an impartial spectator, in 1853, addressed the meeting of Eclectic physicians in reference to the affairs of the Institute, he expressed his sentiments candidly. The following is his language, written by himself. This language is the more remarkable on account of the fact that Dr. Powell and Dr. Buchanan were not on friendly terms. Their scientific doctrines were discordant, and severe criticisms had been made by each on the other. Nevertheless, they had sufficient magnanimity to do justice to each others talents:

"REMARKS OF PROF. POWELL.

"Ex-Professor Jones and myself have always been on social and friendly terms; I have, therefore, no motive to indulge in any unkind remarks or reflections concerning him. I have read his late pamphlet, and from its personal, rancorous and revengeful tone, I am forced to conclude that the promotion of the Eclectic Medical Institute, of this city, is not his object. It appears to me that no one can read it and avoid the conclusion that he would willingly destroy the Institution and the prospects of its cause in the West, to ruin Professor Buchanan, and to cripple the other members of the faculty."

Again he says:

"And if we are to regard his pamphlet as a true index of the depth and strength of his hatred for the faculty, and particularly of Professor Buchanan, we may rest

assured that nothing less than their extermination will satisfy him."

Of Prof. Buchanan, he remarks:

"Neither Professors nor students, nor even yet Professor Jones, have said that he is not a *talented man*, a *ready writer*, and a *fluent lecturer*—that he has not been one of the *main pillars of the Institution* since his election to it."

Then, after speaking of Professors Caldwell of Kentucky, and Jackson of Philadelphia, he says that objections were made to them, but they were retained in their places,

"because they were able men—able because they had the power to make the students think, and consequently to make them more effective. Professor Buchanan's condition is *precisely parallel*—he has not been so fortunate as to make all his colleagues and students believe his doctrines to be true and useful; and, on the other hand, his disbelievers have not succeeded in proving them to be false and mischievous."

"We have frequently done Professor Buchanan the justice to say, that we know of no one who has more power to make others think, who can think, than he, and if Prof. Jones has failed to be benefited, in this wise, by his intercourse with him, the fault is his own misfortune."

It is not necessary to quote this testimony in reference to Dr. Buchanan's abilities as one of the foremost teachers of philosophy in the present age, for his reputation is not confined to the west, nor to the United States, but it answers the purpose of the present exposition, to show that even his opponents recognize what they can not deny.

It is refreshing to observe how deferentially the members of the spurious Faculty have spoken of the professors who now belong to the Faculty, especially of Dr. Buchanan, in whose talents and reputation they have felt a commendable pride, so long as they were able to retain a position near him.

When the serpent-like malice of Dr. L. E. Jones having exhausted itself in every other direction, endeavored to show that the members of the Faculty had privately denounced and opposed Dr. Buchanan, the brand of falsehood was fixed upon the charge, by the specific and positive written denials* from Professors I. G. Jones, J. King, W. Sherwood, J. W. Hoyt, G. W. L. Bickley, and R. S. Newton.

Referring to these statements, we find that Dr. Newton, who had been accustomed privately to speak in the strongest terms of Buchanan's eminence as a physiologist, and the indispensable importance of his services in sustaining the college, made the following brief and comprehensive statement. (See Eclectic Journal, March, 1853, page 136-7.)

"To all whom it may concern.—It is stated in a certain libellous pamphlet, signed by Drs. A. H. Baldrige and S. Kyle, that four members of the present Faculty are opposed to Prof. Buchanan's views in respect to Neurology. As one of that Faculty, I beg to deny that such are my feelings toward the science of Neurology; on the contrary, I regard it as the only true science of man.

R. S. NEWTON, M.D.

"Cincinnati, O., Feb. 19, 1853."

This is Dr. Newton's own language, written without assistance, and clearly written, for him. It declares Dr. Buchanan's system of Anthropology a true science. The word Neurology includes not only Anthropology, but the entire science of the nervous system in the animal kingdom. If Dr. Buchanan's system be recognized as true, he is necessarily recognized as the foremost physiologist of the present age, for he has advanced far beyond his predecessors, and completely revolutionized the science of man by new discoveries. Such was Dr. Newton's opinion, although he has lately combined with the authors of the

* Prof. Morrow was unfortunately dead, but his sentiments are sufficiently indicated by his own publications in the Eclectic Journal, and by the declarations of his most intimate friend, his brother-in-law, Prof. B. L. Hill, and his colleagues, Profs. I. G. Jones and H. P. Gatchell, by whom his true sentiments were shown to be in accordance with his public declarations. The committee of the Eclectic Physicians, of Cincinnati and Covington, including (Dr. Powell, Dr. Wilson, and others) say, in their report in reference to Dr. Morrow: "Being now dead he can not speak, but his most intimate associate and brother in law, Prof. Hill, states in his behalf, (in a letter which we have seen) that in his private conversations, he often expressed his approbation of Dr. Buchanan's private course of lectures, and never expressed any disapprobation to his knowledge."

"libellous pamphlet," to make a little capital by circulating their scurrility against the science.

Dr. G. W. L. Bickley, whose encomiums upon Dr. Buchanan as a man of science, and as one of the greatest writers of the age, were freely uttered and published from his first acquaintance until a few months ago, gave the following statement:

"*ENS. E. M. JOURNAL.*—Permit me to state in answer to an assertion occurring in what purports to be a "*Report of Eclectic Physicians*," stating that the present Faculty, or a large part of them, had ridiculed the science of Anthropology, as taught by Prof. Buchanan, its discoverer. Allow me to say, as an individual of the body of gentlemen on whom this charge is made, to state that I have always (since I knew any thing of it) regarded the Neurological system of Anthropology as the true Science of Man, and that it was a chief source of attraction to the school. Nor have I ever heard any member of the Faculty ridicule or speak disrespectfully of Professor Buchanan in any way; but, on the contrary, so far as I am informed, have heard the present Faculty ever when referring to Prof. Buchanan speak of him as a gentleman of thorough scientific attainments, and a Philosopher in every sense of the word.

Respectfully yours,

G. W. L. BICKLEY, M.D."

This is Dr. Bickley's own phraseology—not very accurate in language, but very full and conclusive as to the sentiments of the Faculty. Yet when Professors are expelled for a want of integrity and fitness, a change of tone is not surprising. Perhaps *Dr. Bickley* may have sufficient self respect not to change his position.

Dr. Powell expresses himself further as follows, after complimenting, separately and collectively, the members of the Faculty:

"Now, in review, I beg leave to remark, that, however people may differ in opinion as to the value of Professor Buchanan's labors, it has ever been admitted by his colleagues, as a body, that he is, as an acquisition to the school, *too valuable to be dispensed with, so long as he is retainable.*"

Dr. Powell expresses a very just estimate of Jones and Baldrige, on the 5th page of his address:

"As I have said, (with reference to Prof. Jones) I have personally no unkind feelings towards Prof. Baldrige; but as he has been intriguing to injure that organization upon which the principal weight of responsibility of medical reform, in this section of our country, rests, I can not forbear to expose him as one of the disaffected, who would brook or risk any mischief to the cause, to break down certain individuals of the organization above alluded to.

"When I was seeking professors for the Memphis Institute, he desired to be one, and when I spoke of King, Newton, and Freeman, he told me that they would not do, that King was not capable, Newton was not of the right *grit*, and Freeman could not be trusted, and consequently he would not serve with them; but he had, he said, two sons-in-law, who were just the men for the occasion. Upon a subsequent occasion I informed him that I had decided upon accepting the services of those gentlemen, and, upon finding that my purpose was fixed, he consented to serve with them, but it so happened that *they* would not serve with *him*. But he was premature in all he did in this relation, for, at no time had I solicited his services. He was not what I wanted, and was too old to become it. It is proper to add, in this place, that before my acquaintance with him, he was hostile to Prof. Buchanan, and to Jones also, I believe.

"We now find that Ex-professors Jones and Baldrige were at the head of this secretly gotten up convention of *Eclectic (?)* physicians, and under all the circumstances connected with this subject can any one imagine it to be possible that opposition to the Institute, inculcated, hatched, and promoted by these gentlemen, can effect any thing more than a public contempt for themselves? Gentlemen, I have more confidence in the wisdom of the public mind than to believe it.

"There is, gentlemen, but one other topic upon which I desire to make a few remarks before concluding.

"Ex-professor Jones has endeavored to make much capital out of the practice of the professors in delivering private lectures. He would have the public to believe that he is singularly honest in refusing to do so—that he taught all he knew in his public course. Upon this subject we can scarcely separate him from the idea of knavery or stupidity."

In the report of the committee, of which Dr. Powell was

chairman, the charge of wilful mendacity and misrepresentation was fixed upon Dr. Jones beyond all escape. So much for the "stupidity," "knavery," "intrigue," "revenge," "stale and exploded calumnies," which disinterested spectators attributed to Jones and Baldrige after full investigation of the subject. Dr. Newton has the honor of going a step further, as will presently be shown. It was he who first suggested the removal of Dr. Jones, although he now wishes to shift his ground and deny his participation, since he has fallen into the company of the man he expelled. August 8, 1852, Dr. Newton wrote to Dr. Buchanan *verbatim et literatim et punctuatim*, as follows:

"I am perfectly disgusted with Jones, and from his expressed intention, there will be no harmony in our school this winter, for this reason I would rather withdraw from the enterprise and let my place be filled by some one who will *acquiesce* in his views. for my own part I can not nor will not, & I will not be charged with causing any trouble, so this will fix the matter at once" * *

"He has expressed himself in this way to many—saying that we Buchanan and Newton wish to fill the chairs with old school men. He said to me the day before he left that he would be *damed* if you or King or any other of the Prof. *delivered* a Private course of lectures this winter, that he would leave the school" * *

"Now this whole school has to yield every thing to him or be continually in hot water" * *

"* * but so soon as you gave him these points he becomes worse than ever he wishes to fill both chairs himself of this I am well satisfied I talked plain with him and tried to convince him that the course he was taking would be an injury to us all, but it was like talking to a barn post I am at a loss to know how you ever got along with him as you have." * *

"I am now sick of this childish disposition and told him if he could not have a better feeling towards us all and had no better opinion of our friendship, that some of us had better leave the concern; he said if his stock was out he would leave it at once" which Dr. N. agreed would be well.

August 20, 1852, Dr. Newton wrote to Dr. Buchanan, urging him, as the senior professor, to take steps to settle the difficulty with Dr. Jones at once, as "no man, with the spirit which should prompt an action, will quietly submit to such a course" as Dr. Jones was taking. He also declared in the letter that he claimed the right to deliver private lectures himself, if he chose, and sent a letter from Prof. King, saying, "you will find a letter from Dr. King, which coincides with my views," in which Dr. K. appealed to Dr. Buchanan as Dean of the Faculty, against the disturbance created by Dr. Jones, saying, "I will not consent to be brow beaten, or rode over rough shod, by any member of the Faculty," and adding, "I would respectfully suggest, that if the minority of the Faculty can not act in harmony with the rest, and in accordance with the understanding on this subject, they be requested to withdraw from the Faculty." * * "If the Faculty are to be arbitrarily governed by one man, the sooner it is known the better."

August 22, 1852, Dr. Newton wrote to Dr. B. "You will see from Dr. Jones' letter, which, I send you, and which you will *pleas preserve* that things are taking an unpleasant and injurious course, but which I feel that we can remedy by prompt action. Dr. Jones's course is wrong in every aspect of the case, and hereafter, for one, I feel willing to *let him out at once*, unless he will act in concert with you King Sherwood and others. You three are now his special *eyecore*, and if you will, you can *cure him at once.*" * * "If Jones quits he will do every thing against us, and may, for a time, be successful. I know that he will leave, unless you and Dr. King will yield to him or leave the Institute, this will not do under any circumstances, as you well know.

"As to buying his stock, this I would not do"

What occurred in '53 was repeated in '56; a factious and stubborn minority would not submit, and would not withdraw. The more scientific and capable men, the majority of the Faculty, would not abandon the Institute to ruin, by surrendering it to the unworthy, and the Board of Trustees settled the difficulty by expelling the disturbers.

In addition to co-operating actively in denouncing Dr. Jones, before the medical class and the public, saying even more in private than was ever published, he denounced him before the Board of Trustees, and signed several papers embodying accusations of the Faculty against Dr. Jones, among which were the following. Drs. Buchanan, King, and Newton, signed an address to the Board of Trustees, containing the following passages:

CHARGES AGAINST DR. L. E. JONES.

"The undersigned, members of the Faculty, are compelled to declare, that if Prof. L. E. Jones continues to occupy his position as a member of the Faculty, they will, without hesitation, resign their respective chairs; and in this declaration they believe that two or three of the gentlemen who have been announced as professors, but who are absent at this time, will heartily concur."

Subsequently, Drs. Newton and Bickley signed with their colleagues, Drs. Buchanan, King, and Sherwood, the following arraignment:

"The undersigned, members of the Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute, hereby arraign Dr. L. E. Jones, the present Professor of Theory and Practice, as *unworthy of a position in the Institute, and request his expulsion*; in proof of the propriety and necessity of which, we offer the following charges, which we declare to be true, to the best of our knowledge and belief."

There are eight separate charges, from which I copy merely the leading passages of each paragraph:

"Charge 1. *Falseness, fraud, and imposition* practiced upon the Board of Trustees and Faculty." * *

"2. *Inveterate hostility* to the existing Faculty of the Institute." * * *

"3. *Systematic warfare* against the Eclectic Medical Institute," by *inveectives, intrigues, &c.*, aiming to establish a separate school.

"4. *Dishonorable and undignified bearing* as a Professor." * *

"5. *Violations of law and order*, by refusing to obey the regulations of the school"—and by a lawless course which compelled the Faculty, "*in self-defense, to lock and fasten the doors of the Institute.*"

"6. *A discordant and quarrelsome temper*, rendering him unfit to associate with any but his inferiors"— * * [Query—is he associated with his inferiors at present?]

"7. *Intense selfishness*, and unwillingness to participate in any liberal measures for the promotion of the reputation of the Institute." * *

"8. *Confirmed and hopeless incompatibility* with the present Faculty." * *

Another charge was embodied in this paper at first, and would have been retained, but for the fact that it was expunged by Dr. Buchanan, for the reason that he considered it absurd for Dr. Newton to present such charges of illiteracy against Dr. L. E. Jones, who could have retorted on Dr. Newton with justice and truth, in a similar style. The following is the charge:

"Professional disqualification of his present position, *not being a practitioner of medicine, being incompetent to sustain the reputation of the Institute* by authorship—being incompetent to address an enlightened public audience in a *respectable manner*, or in any other way to give the Institute an *honorable position* in the public mind—being defective as to the general knowledge of the *different branches of medical science, remarkably ignorant of medical literature*, and settled in confirmed *habits of illiteracy*, which render it certain that he can not keep pace with the progress of the profession."

This expressed the sentiments of the Faculty, and but for their having one *illiterate member* among them, would have been among their charges. These were the charges which, in the opinion of the Faculty, required his expulsion, and by a curious coincidence there is not one of these eight charges against Dr. L. E. Jones in 1852-'53, which was not substantially applicable to Dr. R. S. Newton in 1856. There was the same amount of perfidy and falsehood, the same intrigue and hostility, the same selfishness, differently and more artfully managed, the same illiteracy, and a much greater degree of turbulence and lawlessness. To complete the parallel, he made the same pledges to keep the peace, and broke them as treacherously.

BEACH, NEWTON, AND DIPLOMA SHOPS.

But at that time Dr. Newton was comparatively modest and inoffensive, understood the interests of the College, and, like the rest of the faculty, regarded the three individuals who, since their removal for incompetence and unprofessional conduct, have united together, (Drs. Jones, Beach and Baldrige,) as utterly unworthy of sympathy. Beach and Baldrige, after Dr. Jones had co-operated in their removal for worthlessness and other causes, did not hesitate to help him in abusing the Faculty. Dr. Newton's estimate of Dr. Beach was shown by the Eclectic Journal, and also by Dr. Jones' third pamphlet, page 27—speaking of Dr. Beach, he says:

"Although charged by Dr. Buchanan with imbecility, &c., and by Dr. Newton with ignorance, incompetency, and incapacity to write a single sentence correctly or grammatically, and declared not to be the author of his many works," &c., &c.

Et tu Brute! It was certainly cruel in Dr. Newton to speak of Dr. Beach as being *unable to write correctly*, or not being the *author of his own works*—such charges, if true, should have produced a friendly *fellow feeling* and sympathy between the two *illustrious authors*. By what strange oversight or cruel injustice was Dr. Beach omitted from the Jones and Newton Faculty? Can they not give him an honorary emeritus title? It is no objection that the Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute were unanimously ashamed of him, and dropped his name as quietly as possible, that the public might forget his former connection with the Institute. The fact that he is one of the *offcasts of the Institute* should be the highest recommendation to a *Faculty of offcasts*. We insist that the venerable Beach shall not be slighted to make room for mere fledglings. He can not be more incompetent than Dr. Baldrige, nor has the failure of his diploma shop been so much more disgraceful than the failures of Baldrige and Jones. If Beach considers Anatomy a superfluous study, Baldrige considers Chemistry a humbug when it teaches that *there is iron in the blood*—a prodigious error, according to Dr. Baldrige. If Beach retailed his diplomas indiscriminately by his own authority, Baldrige's establishment disposed of, at least one of his, for \$100 down, in advance, before medical study. If Beach and Baldrige supplied diplomas to men who did not deserve them, Jones surpassed their devotion to suffering humanity, in giving diplomas to those who had been rejected by the tyrannical Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute, who practically deny the rights of American citizens to have diplomas whenever they can pay for them. Detestable aristocrats! They would make distinctions in a democratic profession, and give diplomas to their favorites, but refuse them to every young man who can not answer their troublesome scientific questions. The reign of such tyrants must soon come to an end. The generous liberality of Newton and Jones can supply all demands, and their "*learned brother, O. E. Newton*," the aspiring demonstrator of Anatomy, can furnish as many clinique diplomas to first course students as are required to astonish the natives—each of which diplomas is based upon the fact that its learned bearer has attended thirty-two lectures, and is therefore entitled to a parchment!

Ludicrous as these statements appear, they are all simple naked facts, which can be incontestably proved with names and dates, to the respective transactions. What must be the necessary consequence? Simply, that the entire mass of smattering, indolent, prodigate students and candidates for diplomas, who wish to possess a parchment upon any terms, and care nothing for the character of the school, will resort to the diploma shop where they believe there is the least amount of science and the greatest willingness to drive the *simple bargain*—give me your money and your name, and I will insure that you shall have a diploma. The same class of men who have heretofore resorted to Dr. L. E. Jones for diplomas,* which they could not obtain from the Faculty of the Eclectic Medical Institute, will continue to resort to him and his associates; and if that fungus establishment is maintained, it is difficult to see how the profession at large can escape the disgrace which it will bring upon the entire movement.

But in addition to all this, Dr. Newton took the lead in fixing upon Dr. Jones charges which sunk him irrecoverably into infamy,—charges which were generally believed at the time, which are still believed, and which were made the basis of a legal prosecution.

GROVELING MALICE.

The leading charge was, that Dr. Jones, in order to vent his groveling malice against the College which had ejected

* I have no record of the extent of this diploma business, and I know that in three instances, men who could not graduate in the Institute, have been graduated by the school of Jones & Baldrige, and the members of the Faculty have received letters from worthy and intelligent physicians, complaining of such a course as discreditable to the profession. Of two of these individuals, Dr. J. T., one of the most intelligent graduates of the Institute, says, "I have felt it a duty that I owe alike to the cause and to myself, to disclaim any brotherhood with them, and state to all who have said anything to me about it, that they did not get their diplomas at my alma mater."

him, (being at the same time a violent and vulgar opponent of female medical education, which he assailed in his own obscene manner.) attempted to gratify his revenge by sending to an estimable lady in the class, a number of slanderous, insulting, and obscene anonymous letters, filled with the basest abuse and insults, directed at herself and various gentlemen and ladies of the Institute, designed to convey the idea that her character was infamous, and that she was so esteemed by the class. The letters purported to come from members of the class, and were expressed in the foulest language that ever emanated from a bawdy house. The letters were written in a *disguised hand*, but the disguise was so imperfect that the handwriting of Dr. Jones was easily recognized by all who were familiar with it. Every member of the faculty was satisfied as to the authorship of Dr. Jones, and a large number of students were also sufficiently familiar with his handwriting to recognize it. To place the matter beyond all doubt, the letters were submitted by Dr. Newton and certain legal gentlemen, to the inspection of the best professional experts in the city, who confirmed the opinion that they were in the handwriting of Dr. Jones. Dr. Powell, who is also an expert in handwriting, of great experience in its study, was equally positive as to its authorship. Dr. Newton was ready to testify in court, and the proof was generally considered entirely conclusive.*

In addition to these foul anonymous assaults, reports against the lady were set afloat in the class, which were traced up immediately to Dr. Jones himself. His object was to break up the attendance of female students, to disgrace the school, and to produce a difficulty between the faculty and the class, by the efforts of the former to detect the anonymous slanderers among the members of the class, and the probable aversion of the latter to the presence of females under such circumstances. Dr. Jones was confident that he could thus produce a disturbance, disgrace the Institute, and thus injure the faculty, caring nothing for the fate of the ladies, through whose ruin he expected to glut his revenge. With the usual short sightedness of low cunning, he only exposed his own infamy. The character of the lady was beyond all reproach — no one could have been selected for his attack, who could have been safer from his malice, in the strength of her own integrity. Her only offense consisted in her having refused to lend her signature as a student, to aid his factious operations against his colleagues. The evidence of a deadly design in Dr. Jones, to injure an honorable lady, as a means of injuring the Institute, was so complete, that she adopted the only legal method of obtaining redress for the injury, anxieties, and mental suffering produced by his foul and malignant attack. A suit for slander was instituted against Dr. Jones by his intended victim, laying the damages at \$20,000. Under the influence of this prosecution, he has felt a portion of the suffering which he wished to inflict upon others, and a *wholesome terror* of the law has checked the current of his obscene outpourings.

It is due to this prosecution alone, that the female students of the Institute have been able to live in peace, and

* The active part taken by Dr. Newton in fastening the charge on Dr. Jones, may be further illustrated by the statement of A. B. Fryrear, published by Dr. L. E. Jones:

"Prof. Newton appealed to me in solemn and pathetic terms, to remain with them — he said he was a Christian — a member of the Methodist Church — said his aspirations were not of earth, but of Heaven, &c., &c., when he appealed to me, as a Minister of the Gospel, to avoid Prof. Jones — to not suffer my moral character and standing in the Church, and in society, to become contaminated by such a man; for, said he, Prof. Jones is disgraced upon the records of our College — he is also sued for \$20,000 for slandering an innocent female, &c., &c."

The peculiarly *pious* and *oily* style of Dr. Newton's conversation, as reported by Mr. Fryrear, does not surprise me, as some of his colleagues, including myself, were once of the opinion, from his own intimations that he belonged to the Methodist Church!

that the faculty have been able to open their doors to the worthy ladies, who have graduated from their halls.

The course of justice is slow, but sure, and although Dr. Jones has not yet been tried and convicted, the time will yet arrive when his infamy will crush him out of sight, and when those who have been duped by him will blush at the recollection, and will hold to a severe accountability the miserable faction who have lifted him again into notice, after he had sunk out of sight, and abandoned the profession.

It did not avail Dr. Jones, that he charged Dr. Newton with being himself the author of those obscene letters. The guilt was fixed on himself by the handwriting, and the proof was regarded as conclusive. Nor will it avail him that Dr. Newton has finally come down to his own level of infamy, and made him a companion. Their mutual dishonor is established by mutual testimony, and although it may seem like a farce to attempt to prove anything by either or both of them, they are fully competent to prove each other, by mutual admissions, charges, and contradictions unworthy of all reliance.

SHALL ECLECTICISM SUFFER?

Was there ever in the history of medicine, such a "conglomeration" of every thing professionally unworthy, unfit, unqualified, and dishonorable as this miserable faction has gathered together? Was there ever such an example of unblushing audacity in men who, while assailing their own *acknowledged superiors*, men of high professional standing — demand the public patronage and approbation for an organization based upon illegal and spurious pretensions, upheld only by mob violence and scurrility; consisting of men who not only believe and know, but have publicly declared each other utterly unworthy? Can it be possible that the public, whom they address, contains any number of individuals, who are willing to patronize and identify themselves with this morbid mass, this malignant cancer upon the body of the medical profession?

Is there any reason why American Eclecticism especially should be thus dishonored? The old school institutions of America and Europe have never presented any thing to compare with this foul conspiracy. The great mass of the medical profession have too much sense of honor to tolerate any approximation to such quackery and degradation. Are American Eclectics less sensitive to their professional honor? Do they value their position and character so lightly as to lend their countenance to this malignant conspiracy which has for one of its leading aims, the encouragement of adulterated medicines, and the removal of all the wholesome restraints which belong to professional ethics. It is certain, at least, that if American Eclectics tolerate and support this establishment of diploma-shops, by unprincipled men — the name and the cause will speedily become so foully dishonored, that all honorable teachers and students will hereafter be kept far aloof from such associations.

Whatever may be the merits of the Eclectic system of medicine, students and physicians will be unwilling to connect themselves with an association of men whose public career is discreditable. The organization will dwindle into insignificance and obscurity, and the name will finally be repudiated by all. But I anticipate no such result. The present is the crisis of American Eclecticism. The Institute is now in a better condition than it has ever yet been, for giving a thorough education to its graduates. Let the profession at large treat with silent contempt, as they have done heretofore, the movements of factious pretenders, and the future of our cause will be more encouraging than ever.

W. SHERWOOD, M.D.

N. B. Anticipating that all the arts of falsehood and misrepresentation will be used to counteract the effect of this plain exposition, I would remark that it is but a just and fair statement, the truth of which can be established in every particular, and the documents upon which it is based are in my possession, and may be seen by any gentleman who wishes to inspect them.

W. S.

243 Court Street, Cincinnati.